

"This powerful and hard-hitting book lays bare the reality and risks of the homosexual agenda."

— FORMER CONGRESSMAN J. C. WATTS

THE AGENDA

THE HOMOSEXUAL PLAN TO CHANGE AMERICA

Truthful answers you need to know...

- *Is homosexuality genetic or is it a choice?*
- *What impact will this agenda have on our schools, colleges, and workplaces?*
- *How can we protect and educate our children?*
- *What does God really say about homosexuality?*

REV. LOUIS P. SHELDON

Founder and Chairman of the Traditional Values Coalition

THE

AGENDA

REV. LOUIS P. SHELDON

FRONTLINE

A STRANG COMPANY

MOST STRANG COMMUNICATIONS/CHARISMA HOUSE/SILOAM/
FRONTLINE products are available at special quantity discounts
for bulk purchase for sales promotions, premiums, fund-raising,
and educational needs. For details, write Strang Communications/
Charisma House/Siloam, 600 Rinehart Road, Lake Mary, Florida
32746, or telephone (407) 333-0600.

THE AGENDA by Rev. Louis P. Sheldon

Published by FrontLine

A Strang Company

600 Rinehart Road

Lake Mary, Florida 32746

www.charismahouse.com

This book or parts thereof may not be reproduced in any form, stored
in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form by any means—
electronic, mechanical, photocopy, recording, or otherwise—without
prior written permission of the publisher, except as provided by United
States of America copyright law.

Unless otherwise noted, all Scripture quotations are from the King
James Version of the Bible.

Scripture quotations marked NKJV are from the New King James Ver-
sion of the Bible. Copyright © 1979, 1980, 1982 by Thomas Nelson,
Inc., publishers. Used by permission.

Cover design by Judith McKittrick

Copyright © 2005 by Rev. Louis P. Sheldon

All rights reserved

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Sheldon, Louis P.

The agenda / Louis P. Sheldon.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 1-59185-796-1 (hardback)

1. Homosexuality--Religious aspects--Christianity. 2. Gay rights--Religious aspects--Christianity. 3. Homosexuality--United States. 4. Gay rights--United States. 5. Gay liberation movement--United States. I. Title.

BR115.H6S54 2005

261.8'35766'0973--dc22

2005009530

05 06 07 08 09 — 987654321

Printed in the United States of America

CONTENTS

Introduction: Wanted: A Faithful Witness

Part I: Facts and Fiction

1 Destructive Forces

2 A Campaign of Deception

3 A Public Health Disaster

Part II: Changing the Culture

4 Beyond Law and Order

5 Changes in the Workplace

6 Taking Over the Schools

Part III: Safeguarding the Future

7 Safeguarding the Family

8 Awakening the Church

9 Restoring Traditional Values

10 What's to Be Done?

Notes

Bibliography

Index

INTRODUCTION

WANTED: A FAITHFUL WITNESS

Homosexuality is out of sync with God's creation, and it is contrary to the natural order. A homosexual relationship is exactly the opposite of what God ordained. Take anything that was created or designed to operate one way and reverse the sequence of operation, and the inevitable result is destruction. Same-sex unions strike at the very image of God and the natural order.¹

-MATTHEW STAYER

IT'S A SCENE you'll never forget, a reality you should never have to endure: Saturday night in a San Francisco bathhouse-a reality so sordid, so shocking, so sinful and morally repulsive you will never see it on the evening news. Howard Stern's pornographic radio and television broadcasts don't come close, and even the eighteenthcentury sensualist the Marquis de Sade could scarcely have imagined the sheer degradation and perversion that occur in places like this on a regular basis-virtually around the clock.

Amidst all the posturing and campaigning for "equal rights" and "civil rights" by the homosexual lobby, pretending they only want the same privileges that other families enjoy, these scenes reveal the sordid truth as well as the lies that prop up the homosexual agenda. And that's why you will never see them on the major networks. It's no accident that the media avoid these images like the plague: one glimpse of what really happens in the heartland of the homosexual movement and their campaign of deception would be finished. If middle America ever wakes up to what it's really all about-what homosexuals and lesbians actually do to one another and what they have in mind for your innocent sons and daughters-the "sacred cause" of sodomy would be forever lost.

But, in a sense, that's precisely what needs to happen. While no one should ever be exposed to these conscience-searing and mindnumbing scenes of human depravity, this once Christian nation is under assault today as never before, and millions of Americans are in denial. They've either accepted the idea that homosexuality is a natural "alternative lifestyle;" or they've been cowed into silence by the fear-mongering and name-calling of those who, behind a banner of "tolerance" and "diversity," seek to silence the truth and abolish moral judgment in any form.

It's only too apparent now that it's not only foreign terrorists that we need to fear today. The most dangerous radicals who threaten our way of life are

those who live among us. They already hold positions of esteem in government, the courts, our schools and colleges, and even the world of business; and you can be certain they will destroy us if we don't take steps to defeat their radical agenda now. Young people in our schools and colleges are being bombarded on virtually an hourly basis with false and misleading information in an effort to draw them into a dangerous and deadly conspiracy. And I'm sad to say that far too often it seems to be working.

A column by homosexual activist Michael Swift, published in the Gay Community News in February 1987, then later reprinted in the Congressional Record, reveals the dark purposes of many in the so-called "gay rights movement" His long and vulgar diatribe expresses the growing sense of outrage many homosexuals feel for straight America. The article began with the shocking words:

We shall sodomize your sons, emblems of your feeble masculinity, of your shallow dreams and vulgar lies. We shall seduce them in your schools, in your dormitories, in your gymnasiums, in your locker rooms, in your sports arenas, in your seminaries, in your youth groups, in your movie theater bathrooms, in your army bunkhouses, in your truck stops, in your all male clubs, in your houses of Congress, wherever men are with men together. Your sons shall become our minions and do our bidding. They will be recast in our image. They will come to crave and adore us.

This vulgar attack went on for several paragraphs, describing in unfiltered detail the sort of perversion and hostility that lie at the root of this dangerous emotional disturbance.

Clearly, these were not the words of a repressed minority seeking equal rights but a violent tirade from the pit of hell. Men and women determined to undermine the American way of life have a profound hatred for the Christian values that made this nation great. They want not only to redefine the concept of family and normal sexual relationships but also to destroy the family as we know it, and they have said as much. The promoters of the homosexual agenda are full of resentment and anger, mixed with self-loathing and shame, and they won't stop until they have eradicated every trace of morality and self-restraint unless by God's grace we decide to rise up and say no and somehow put a stop to their desperate gambit.

DISCOVERING THE TRUTH

Thanks to years of sophisticated public relations and the support of the major news media and educators at all levels, from kindergarten to the ivory tower, today's homosexual activists have managed to convince many of our neighbors that Christianity-and especially the Christian Right-is the real enemy. It's another example of the way they turn everything upside down.

But make no mistake: those who are working night and day to abolish our capacity for moral judgment are the enemy we ought to fear. That is why I have written this book, to present the facts, to expose the hypocrisy and deceit, and to remind all Americans what we stand to lose if we fail to take action now to stop, once and for all, the agenda of the homosexual Left.

This book examines the history of the homosexual movement and the ruthless tactics of the gay rights movement. In particular, I look at how the homosexual agenda has invaded our schools, colleges, workplaces, churches, and homes. From the Stonewall Riots of 1969 to the infamous 1993 Gay and Lesbian March on Washington, as well as the "gay pride" parades that are held in many American cities today, I have presented a retrospective of how widespread public acceptance of sexual deviance is being used as a weapon against Christianity and traditional moral values.

I look in some depth at how the homosexuals have seized control of the mainstream media and the popular culture, and why the American Psychiatric Association capitulated to homosexual activists who forced these medical professionals to abandon their official policy that classified same-sex attraction as a mental disorder. And, of course, I also include a discussion of what you can do to help stop the radical transformation of our culture and how you can support the effort to protect future generations of young Americans from this insidious evil.

Medical researchers and epidemiologists have shown that homosexual practices are invariably linked to serious and long-term illnesses. AIDS and HIV are foremost among them, of course, but today's homosexual-friendly culture is in denial about the explosion of sexually transmitted diseases in the gay community. With the active complicity of many on the political Left, there is a wide-scale effort to make us believe that homosexuality is a "civil right" and that AIDS is somehow a "badge of honor" rather than the medical scourge and worldwide epidemic it truly is. Fortunately, the African American community has been quick to challenge this fraud, making it clear that homosexuality is no civil right. And I tell that story as well.

In his important book *Homosexuality and the Politics of Truth*, Dr. Jeffrey Satinover illustrates in graphic detail the terrible price exacted by homosexual acts on the human body. I've cited some of that information in these pages. Yet, despite reams of hard-hitting and authoritative information on this subject, and despite fifteen years of educational programs to teach young men and women how to avoid risky behaviors, the homosexual community continues to push their "deathstyle" more aggressively than ever. And thanks to the advocacy of Hollywood and the sympathetic news media, millions more will die as a result-as another generation of innocent children is being captured by their villainy and deception.

Dr. John R. Diggs, a member of the Massachusetts Family Institute and an expert on the effects of AIDS and HIV, reports that the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) and acquired immunodeficiency syndrome

(AIDS) are by far the leading causes for early mortality in the homosexual community. The infection rates for HIV are highest among homosexual men—as compared to the next most high-risk group, intravenous drug users—and substantially higher than that among heterosexual men and women. In some homosexual communities, HIV infections approach 50 percent.² Furthermore: "High-risk behaviors;" as Dr. Diggs points out, "will continue to be associated with serious life-threatening consequences and significantly shortened life expectancies among gay and bisexual men."³

But is the homosexual community telling us this? Absolutely not. Homosexual men face extremely high risk for certain types of cancerous malignancies, including lymphoma and anal cancer.⁴ But you will never hear this on the news either. Research has shown that human papilloma virus (HPV) infections among gay men are primarily responsible for a high rate of anal cancer.⁵ The incidence of anal cancer among homosexual men now exceeds that of cervical cancer in women, but you'd have to be a detective to find facts like these in the highly charged political environment of today's homosexual movement. And this is a case where ignorance is not bliss.

According to research by Dr. E. L. Goldman, 30 percent of currently twenty-year-old gay men will be HIV positive or dead of AIDS by the age of thirty.⁶ Equally distressing, the journal *Omega* reports that the average age of death for HIV-infected men is thirty-nine, while the average age of death of homosexual men from all other causes is just forty-two.⁷ The problem is not merely the type of sex preferred by homosexuals but the lifestyle they engage in. Disease, infections, alcohol and drug addition, and injury are common, and domestic violence is a major problem among both homosexual men and women—at a rate at least twice that of heterosexual couples.⁸ And the evidence of social and emotional dysfunction is equally dire.

Research by Drs. Alan Bell and Martin Weinberg reveals that 43 percent of white male homosexuals estimate having had sex with five hundred or more different partners, and 28 percent report more than a thousand sexual partners. Fully 79 percent of those surveyed admitted that at least half of their partners were strangers. A study in the early 1980s revealed that only about 2 percent of homosexuals are "monogamous or semi-monogamous;" which means that they've had ten or fewer partners in their lifetime.⁹

THE ROOT OF THE PROBLEM

The power of the homosexual movement rests on two factual distortions. The first is that homosexuals are "born gay" and cannot change. The second is the myth that 10 percent of the population is homosexual. The origin of both these claims, which have been shown false repeatedly by scientists, was the research of Dr. Alfred Kinsey, who shocked the world in the 1940s and 1950s with statistics about human sexuality that were largely fabricated,

falsified, and fraudulent. I examine Kinsey's work and his outrageous claims at length in chapter two.

In fact, no one is born "gay" Gays, lesbians, bisexuals, and transgen- ders, as they like to be identified, are generally people who have suffered either emotional trauma or sexual abuse early in life and whose same-sex attractions in a large number of cases are actually the result of coping mechanisms compounded by inappropriate erotic stimulation during adolescence. There are many critical factors in such an assessment, of course, but the one certainty is that homosexuality is a choice that can be overcome and reversed, as many ex-gays-including some whose stories are told in the final section of this book-will attest.

The average homosexual relationship is highly unstable and terribly unhappy. A 1982 study of AIDS victims by the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention found that eleven hundred sexual partners was about average for gay men, with some reporting as many as twenty thousand partners in their lifetime.¹⁰ Such a life produces fear, anxiety, guilt, anger, and other disturbing emotions that can do great damage to the human soul. In addition, many surveys have confirmed the extremely high mortality rate among homosexuals due not only to AIDS, STDs, cancers, and bacterial infections, but also to violence, substance abuse, accidents, murder, and an inordinately high rate of suicide. It staggers the imagination that anyone trapped in these circumstances could willingly defend that lifestyle. By any standard, there is nothing "gay" about it.

But the problems that arise from this highly sexualized and pathologically exploitative environment are not restricted to the homosexual community. The National Education Association (NEA) and the Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network (GLSEN) have teamed up to promote homosexuality in the nation's public schools. In fact, the president of the NEA, Robert Chase, was the featured speaker at GLSEN's annual conference in October 2000. In his address, Chase told members of the homosexual teachers organization that the NEA is committed to "ending bias and bigotry" against homosexuals, and he added that his union plans on developing resources to promote homosexuality to all students in the nation's schools.¹¹

Is this what parents really want? Is this what schools ought to be doing? Like it or not, this is what children are being taught in virtually every schoolroom in this country, and it gets even worse. GLSEN claims more than twenty-five hundred chapters on school campuses, and the object of all of these clubs is to desensitize children and their parents to the perversion of homosexuality and to recruit the next generation of homosexuals in the classrooms.

A conference sponsored by GLSEN at Tufts University in Boston even taught teenagers how to perform "fisting" on their sexual partners, by showing them how to shove their fist and arm into the anus of another

person. Instructors also discussed oral copulation and what they should know about swallowing semen and body fluids.¹² Fortunately, this shocking bit of news was made public, and the citizens of that state were appropriately outraged, but many similar incidents go unreported. In another story, we learned of the high incidence of molestation of children in the public schools and the unusually high percentage of young boys who are victimized by their homosexual teachers. The same article revealed that girls molested in the classrooms, in many cases, actually develop an ongoing "relationship" with their abusers.¹³

Honest reporting of these crimes can help stop what's becoming an epidemic of perversion. But standing up takes courage and resources, particularly when the homosexual lobby has convinced many members of Congress, state legislatures, local governments, and even private businesses to enact antidiscrimination policies or "hate crimes" laws to punish people who protest against this disturbing movement on moral grounds. In these pages I look at how totalitarian measures are being pushed by United States senators, congressmen, governors, and mayors of many large cities to punish honest citizens who speak openly and honestly about the inherent dangers of homosexuality. And I also show how Christians are fighting back.

Hate crimes laws are a form of legal apartheid—a new kind of segregation where individuals are "separate and unequal" under our system of justice. The vast majority of Americans do not accept the notion that the law should provide extra legal protections for certain individuals simply because of the way they engage in sex. Yet that is what the politically correct promoters of hate crimes laws are trying to do.

Dr. Daniel Troy, a scholar and researcher at the American Enterprise Institute in Washington, says he fears that this new emphasis on creating racial, religious, gender, and other special interest groups can only divide the nation further. In testimony before Congress, Dr. Troy quoted historian Arthur Schlesinger who said that separatism of this kind "nourishes prejudices, magnifies differences, and stirs antagonisms"¹⁴ And, sadly, this seems to be precisely what the homosexual agenda is after—to divide, delude, and destroy our moral judgment.

PRESERVING THE FAMILY

Throughout recorded history, and long before that, no doubt, the family has been the basis of civilized society. A father, a mother, and their children. This is the foundation and building block of the community and the cornerstone of social well-being. Yet, this is now the target of the homosexual agenda. The great aim of the homosexual lobby and its supporters, as quoted in many places in this book, is to eradicate the moral framework of American society and to elevate and legislate promiscuous couplings of every imaginable type. What they seek is not only the

legalization but also the legitimization of deviant behaviors that the Bible (along with every great society) has referred to as an "abomination"

Is there any chance of stopping this assault on morality? You be the judge. In November 2004, America witnessed the largest voter turnout in our history, and the driving force behind that monumental showing was the 22 percent of people who identified themselves in exit polls as "values voters" They voted in overwhelming numbers for candidates who supported traditional moral values. And in the fourteen states that voted on initiatives to ban "same-sex marriage," every single one of those measures passed with unprecedented levels of support by the voters. Even in Oregon, which favored the Democrat candidate, John Kerry, and is well known for its liberal politics, the voters approved the ban on same-sex marriage by a whopping 57 percent.¹⁵

That election is over now, and the desires of these values voters will have to be translated into policy and laws, and that is another reason for this book. What happens at the polls in 2006, 2008, and 2012 will determine the fate of this nation. As we deal in the weeks and months ahead with a contentious Supreme Court, out-of-control federal judges, lawmakers bent on remaking this country in their own liberal image, along with liberal policymakers in our cities, schools, and universities, we will have our work cut out for us. We need facts, figures, and useful information to help us to fight the good fight.

As a minister of the Christian gospel and chairman of the Traditional Values Coalition, I am deeply concerned about our moral wellbeing, and, for that matter, I worry about the survival of this nation. In a number of places in this book I look at the risks we face and how other nations that have trespassed God's moral order have fallen and disappeared in the sands of time. As we begin to deal with the dangers we face at this late hour, it's up to you and me, along with all those who care deeply about the welfare of future generations of Americans, to help restore our great legacy. We must take back this nation, by sheer moral force, and restore the foundations of moral order before it's too late.

This has not been an easy book for me to write. The homosexual agenda is an all-out assault on everything we believe in and an attack on everything our Founding Fathers hoped to give us when they fought to establish this great nation. In many places in these pages you will encounter facts or language that may be troubling. I wish the story could be told in other ways, but if we want to resist what the homosexual lobby is doing to this country, then we can't afford to look away. We need to have the moral courage to face these facts in order to know our enemy. But the good news is that if we're strong enough and resilient enough in this battle, gaining knowledge that will help to empower our resistance, then I am convinced that we will witness a tremendous victory, and, with God's help, we shall overcome.

What you will encounter in the chapters that follow is the witness of one

man who has spent a large portion of the last thirty-three years learning about this dangerous agenda and standing against the tactics of a relentless enemy. The task has not been pleasant or easy, but I can do no less. To defend the God-given virtues and values of this nation is my calling, and it's in that spirit that I offer this work for your use and consideration.

Part I, which follows now, is entitled "Facts and Fiction," and offers a broad look at the homosexual agenda and the dramatic differences between the fraudulent claims and the deadly realities of this devastating lifestyle. Part II, "Changing the Culture;" looks at how the homosexual lobby is attacking the American culture today in the courts, the workplace, and the schools. Part III, "Safeguarding the Future;" then explores areas where Christians and others are standing up to fight back. These chapters deal with safeguarding the family, awakening the power of the church, and restoring the moral fabric of the nation. In the final chapters, I offer an assessment and some suggestions for ways that you can be involved.

All in all, my goal in preparing this work has been to help each reader understand how pernicious the homosexual agenda truly is, and to call forth millions of faithful men and women-very much like that faithful 22 percent that took charge in the November 2004 elections-to rise in the defense of marriage, the family, and this great nation, for which the founders were willing to sacrifice their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

I pray that God will inspire you to be a part of this great undertaking and that you will make a renewed commitment to restoring moral judgment in our land.

DESTRUCTIVE FORCES

The homosexual movement has been very successful at removing the sensitivity and stigma formerly associated with non-heterosexual attractions. The whole sexual liberation movement, hetero as well as homo, has expertly manipulated public opinion for close to half a century. People are so afraid of "judge not, lest ye be judged" that they feel they must tolerate anything.¹

-CONNIE MARSHNER FEBRUARY 8, 2002

THE MORAL DEBATE that politicians and pundits refer to as the culture war in America is a real war, in every sense of the word. It's not just a clever turn of phrase or some kind of journalistic shorthand, but a dynamic confrontation, as sociologist James Davison Hunter has said, between forces with two dramatically different visions for America. It's a struggle to define who we are, what we believe, and how we will live our lives in this modern age.²

On one side of this war are those who believe in traditional moral values and biblical standards of right and wrong. We are defending historic moral principles that have undergirded American society for more than three hundred years-and we are fighting to preserve the integrity of our homes and our families. On the other side are those who believe that anything goes. They are men and women who will accept no civil restraint or moral limits on their sexual freedom. The result is that we're engaged in a life-and-death struggle, with fierce battles, real casualties, and very real consequences. For those of us who adhere to a traditional understanding of faith, family, and freedom, the stakes could not be higher.

At a time when America's military is already battling terrorists halfway around the world, we find ourselves engaged in mortal combat at home as well. The forces of darkness are arrayed against us on many fronts. The battlefields of today's culture war are well known to most of us. They include issues such as abortion, euthanasia, the education of our children, day care, feminism, multiculturalism, judicial activism, resisting the anti-Christian and anti-American bias of the liberal media, and fending off the increasingly aggressive forays of those on the social and political Left against religious liberty and biblical interpretation.

Most recently we have witnessed a series of controversial attacks on public expressions of religion, including the attempt by atheist attorney Michael Newdow to strip the words "under God" from the Pledge of Allegiance, followed by his efforts to prevent President George W. Bush from taking the Oath of Office in January 2005 with his hand on the Bible—a custom dating back to George Washington.³ Apparently there is no area of faith or morality the Left won't attack, but there is no area of dispute more volatile or more important to America's future than that which is the subject of this book: the legitimization and normalization of homosexuality.

Thanks to years of social conditioning and the constant drumbeat of homosexual activists—aided by their allies in the media—many people have apparently decided that homosexuality is no longer a matter of concern. Either homosexuals have a right to do as they please in the privacy of their own homes, or, as some would say, "It's nobody's business but their own!" So, they ask, what right do we have to impose our morals on the rest of America?

There was a time when the answers to such questions would have been obvious. Not only were there cultural prohibitions on behaviors of this kind—with a four-thousand-year history of cultural disapproval—but statistics regarding death, disease, and the other social dysfunctions associated with homosexuality were too overpowering to ignore.⁴ But that is no longer the case. As much as anything else, the homosexual agenda has been a carefully crafted plan to blind ordinary Americans to the truth. Through lies, disinformation, falsified data, and manipulation of the news media, homosexual activists have shielded millions from a reality so obvious that only a morally impoverished nation could fail to see it.

From the beginning, the homosexual agenda to erase moral values from our minds and our public policy has been so relentless and so successful that a practical understanding of the risks of homosexual behavior can no longer be assumed.

The greatest tragedy as a result of this agenda is precious lives are being lost every day. Thousands are dying either from their own bad choices or from ignorance about the genuine dangers of the "gay lifestyle." The entire agenda of the homosexual Left is founded upon a conspiracy of ignorance, superimposed over a sophisticated public relations campaign designed by homosexual activists to normalize their lifestyle and induce millions of young people to experiment sexually—often with deadly consequences.

But no matter how much they may try to force middle America to accept a "live and let live" philosophy, we will never do that. For one thing, the gay and lesbian community will not settle for mere "tolerance." They have a strategic plan to enforce, not just tolerate, complete acceptance and affirmation of their lifestyle. They will settle for nothing less than the utter defeat of all who oppose them. But also, Christian compassion forbids us to

concede the victory while so many innocent lives are still at risk. So the struggle continues, and the signs of war are all around us.

DEFENDING THE TRUTH

The news from Canada and Europe ought to give us fair warning of where this battle may be headed if we fail to react appropriately. The Human Rights Commission of the Canadian province of Saskatchewan recently decided that a newspaper ad that quoted biblical passages about homosexuality was a "human rights offense"⁵ Subsequently, both the newspaper and the individual who placed the ad were forced to pay three homosexual accusers \$1,500 each. During the same period, the Supreme Court of British Columbia upheld the suspension without pay of a high school teacher because he had written a letter to the editor of his local newspaper stating his belief that "no one is born homosexual." ⁶

Unfortunately, cases like these are not unique. Wherever homosexuality is recognized as a viable alternative lifestyle, anyone who dares to speak out with a different point of view may be subjected to harsh penalties. In England, for example, the Right Reverend Dr. Peter Forster, the Anglican bishop of Chester, was investigated by Cheshire police under hate crimes laws for merely saying that some people can overcome homosexual inclinations and "reorientate" themselves. ⁷ In January 2004, a Christian pastor in Sweden was prosecuted for "hate speech" after giving a sermon that included biblical references to homosexuality.⁸ In Belgium, Cardinal Gustaaf Joos was sued for comments he made in a local magazine about homosexuality.⁹ And in Spain, Cardinal Antonio Varela is facing legal action for speaking against homosexuality in a sermon at the Cathedral of Madrid.¹⁰

And this is only a sample of what is ahead for this country if homosexual efforts to abolish moral judgment are successful. If things continue at the pace they're on, homosexuality will soon be not just a tolerated behavior but a civil right, and same-sex relationships will be deemed morally superior to heterosexual relationships. This has been the stated goal of gay activists from the first.¹¹ And it's not hard to imagine that, if they have their way, "homosexual rights" will become the unquestioned law of the land.

I can attest from my own experience that there are physical and emotional risks involved in defending the truth against the promoters of the homosexual agenda. I have been attacked, insulted, threatened, and physically accosted by homosexuals dozens of times over the last twenty years, and I have feared for the safety of my wife and family more than once. But I have not been intimidated by them, because I know that truth is on our side. On one occasion, the liberal pundit Jimmy Breslin attempted to vilify me in a column, which appeared on April 7, 2004, that quoted me as saying that, "Homosexuals are dangerous.... They proselytize. They come to the door, and if your son answers and nobody is there to stop it, they grab

the son and run off with him. They steal him. They take him away and turn him into a homosexual"¹²

Of course, I never said anything of the kind, and I don't remember ever being interviewed by the self-described "hard-drinking" columnist. So I got in touch with the editors of Newsday, where his column appears, and we went back and forth for some time. When the smoke finally cleared, Newsday apologized to me. Breslin claimed he had conducted that so-called "interview" twelve years earlier at the Republican National Convention. He had no notes, of course, and little more than a vague recollection of a brief meeting in a hallway. The Associated Press reported later that Newsday issued a retraction, saying that Breslin's column "did not adhere to Newsday's standard of publishing only direct quotations that are accurate and precise."¹³

When the AP reporter asked Newsday editor Les Payne whether or not Breslin would be punished for his false statements, Payne said simply, "Obviously, whatever action is taken, we keep it in house.... " And then he added, "He [Breslin] made a mistake, and he admits that"¹⁴ That remains an important illustration, for me and others who lobby with me in Washington, of the value of standing your ground. While there are many conservative media watchdog groups, few have been able to get an acknowledgment of journalistic wrongdoing at the level of the Jimmy Breslin/Newsday episode.

But I will also say that the ground I stand on is much too solid for me to be defeated or to lose confidence in the face of adversity. Whether it's homosexual hit squads, angry activists, or irate columnists, I'm not going to take my eyes off of the goal, because the need is too great. There will always be many challenges for those who stand on moral principle, but there's a lot we can do to help turn the tide if we are willing to stand our ground and respond in a conscientious manner. I will chronicle other incidents where I've had to stand against these activists, and in more detail, in subsequent chapters.

WHERE IT ALL STARTED

To understand what we're up against, a little history is in order. According to one sympathetic account, the modern homosexual movement in America began as part of the trend toward urbanization in the late nineteenth century when dislocated workers began leaving the family farms and moving to the big cities. Many who were separated from their families in those days took jobs that were often dirty and dehumanizing, and along the way some of them succumbed to the lure of alcohol and sexual vice. In places like San Francisco's Barbary Coast district, New York's Greenwich Village, and the New Orleans French Quarter, it was easy for young men to fall in with companions with low morals and few scruples, and before long a homosexual subculture began to emerge.

In addition to the brothels and saloons of the era, a number of bars sprang up that catered primarily to homosexuals. To avoid scrutiny and protect their clientele from arrest, the owners of those places often paid protection money to corrupt public officials or police, and the bond of secrecy that developed around these hangouts helped to create a sense of unity (and conspiracy) among the patrons, which contributed to the birth of the homosexual movement.

From the earliest foundations of America to the mid-1960s, the penalty for homosexual behavior was serious indeed. Every state had laws that made homosexuality a crime, and a guilty verdict could lead to imprisonment or admission to a mental institution. During the Second World War, however, changes began to creep in. When millions of servicemen were sent off to the front, many civilian jobs that had been held by men were taken by women. Before long the workforce was predominantly made up of women, and this newfound independence, accompanied by greater access to alcohol and sexual experimentation, led to a breakdown in traditional sex roles for women as well, and the historic bulwark of chastity and feminine modesty began to break down.

When the war ended, many who had tasted forbidden fruits, either in the military service or in the wartime economy, found the doors suddenly closing on their illicit activities. But, as one writer has put it, "the genie of lesbian and gay experimentation had been let out of the bottle. Things could never be quite the same again."¹⁵ During the war, the port cities of New York, San Francisco, and New Orleans became havens for all sorts of hedonistic activities. Bars and brothels were common, and before long homosexual enclaves became common as well.

For whatever reasons, California's lawmakers were apparently more tolerant of such vices, and over the next several years tens of thousands of lesbians and homosexual men relocated to the state. Artists, poets, musicians, and actors who had long been associated with alcohol and drug abuse were among the first to be attracted by the new atmosphere of rebellion against traditional morality and the sexual promiscuity that came with it. After the "Beat" movement took root in the San Francisco Bay Area, popularized by writers such as Jack Kerouac, Allen Ginsburg, and Gregory Corso in the forties and fifties, the region became known as "the capital of the homosexual movement in America."

But the 1950s had a serious side as well, and the House UnAmerican Activities Committee, headed by Senator Joseph McCarthy of Wisconsin, soon discovered that the homosexual community in this country was permeated by communists. In fact, the foremost leader of the so-called "homophile" movement at the time, Harry Hay, was not only a flagrant homosexual but also a long-standing member of the Communist Party USA, and he had been trained in the Soviet Union.¹⁶

Under the Bolsheviks during the 1920s, the communists in Russia had been tolerant of all sorts of deviant behavior, and at one point the decriminalization of homosexuality was a platform issue. Later, however, when Joseph Stalin came to power, the Soviets launched a purge of known homosexuals, and it was at that point, during the mid-fifties, that Harry Hay left the Communist Party to launch a movement of his own called the Mattachine Society, dedicated to the protection and promotion of homosexuality.

In this new role, Hay called for "an ethical homosexual culture" and compared the plight of homosexuals to that of blacks, Jews, and Mexican Americans. He then organized what he termed "discussion groups" to promote the gay agenda and to assure gay men and lesbians that the guilt and discomfort they felt because of their sexual choices were the result of "social conditioning," and not because of any flawlet alone any sin-in their own lives.

COMMUNIST CONNECTIONS

Early on, the Mattachine Society developed a network of cells very much in the style of the Communist Party USA, arranged in five tiers or "orders" The leaders of the movement made up, not surprisingly, the fifth or highest order. Those in the lower echelons were given a range of duties and responsibilities, including recruiting new members, setting up community meetings and activist rallies, and interacting with the press.

Over the next several years, the Mattachine Society experienced many ups and downs and sudden changes of fortune. In 1952 they managed to block the prosecution of a homosexual man when it was shown that he had been a victim of police entrapment. This appeared to be a welcome victory for the cause, but the group's ties to the communists, and the deeply held religious beliefs of most Americans-combined with the natural repulsion most people felt toward homosexuality-meant that Harry Hay and his colleagues were still perceived by most people as a group of dangerous agitators and sexual perverts.

During the fifties, members of the Mattachine Society participated in civil rights marches in the South, not only to substantiate their leftist credentials but to recruit supporters for their cause. One of these men, Frank Kameny, a government worker who had been fired when his homosexuality was exposed, became a spokesman for the "homophile movement" and declared himself a "full-time activist" for "gay rights"

Kameny said he would do for homosexuals what Martin Luther King Jr. was doing for blacks, and when the phrase "Black is beautiful" became a popular slogan of the civil rights movement, Kameny came up with the phrase, "Gay is good." Those words were less convincing for most

Americans, but other factors were about to come into play that would change everything.¹⁷

Just over a decade after Harry Hay launched the Mattachine Society, America was engaged in a full-blown social and cultural revolution. Thanks to the radical teachings of left-wing academics such as Herbert Marcuse, Theodor Adorno, Antonio Gramsci, and others on the Left, American university campuses were suddenly ablaze with protests against everything from grading standards to the War in Vietnam. From Columbia in the east to Berkeley in the west, there were marches and riots, with students chanting the slogans of the "black power" movement, the women's movement, the "free love" movement, and much more. In the middle of all this radicalism and revolt, the fledgling homosexual movement suddenly lurched out of the closet and into the mainstream.

Today, gay activists can be found in virtually every large city in America, and every large university (with few exceptions) offers its students a "gay and lesbian track." In the guise of fighting prejudice and discrimination toward gay men and women, these activists are actively promoting the homosexual lifestyle to our children and working with elements of the media and the national teachers unions to indoctrinate kids as young as four and five years old into accepting (and experimenting with) dangerous sexual behaviors.

Predictably, the homosexual cause was taken up by the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), whose roots were also in the Communist Party USA, and suddenly homosexuals began winning cases in court and gaining new converts in many other segments of the culture.¹⁸ But the greatest coup of the homosexual movement by far was coercing the American Psychiatric Association (APA) in 1973 to remove homosexuality from the list of "mental disorders" in its Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM). This sudden change of policy was not based on any new scientific evidence, but it was a purely political move, brought about by a relentless campaign of threats, intimidation, and collusion between certain members of the APA and the homosexual activist lobby.

By 1968, representatives of the homosexual Left had approached officers of various psychiatric organizations and their standards committees, demanding that these organizations reclassify same-sex attractions as a normal manifestation of human sexuality. Activists realized early in the campaign that their only hope of gaining broad public acceptance for their practices would be if the members of the psychiatric community were to change their policies and remove the stigma, as old as the helping professions themselves, that identified homosexuality as a "mental disorder"

A DANGEROUS COMPROMISE

In an effort to slow down this initiative, which some individuals were trying to ram through the organization, the APA agreed to participate in a three-year study of the issue to determine what their future policy on homosexuality ought to be. But from the first, members of the APA's Homosexuality Task Force collaborated actively with homosexual organizations such as the Mattachine Society, the Gay Activist's Alliance, and a lesbian group known as the Daughters of Bilitis, and at the same time they ignored any research or anecdotal evidence that was not favorable to the homosexual agenda.

Dr. Abram Kardiner, a former professor of psychiatry at Columbia University, reported that, "A powerful lobby of 'gay' organizations has brought pressure on the American Psychiatric Association to remove homosexuality from the category of aberrancy. This is only one facet of the tidal wave of egalitarianism and divisiveness that is sweeping the country....

"19

Throughout this review process, as related later by Paul Gebhard, who was a colleague of the radical sexologist Alfred Kinsey, anyone known to harbor the belief that homosexuality was a mental disorder was excluded from being a member of the Task Force. And those who might wish to speak up in defense of the historic standards of the organization were denied the right to speak or even to submit written comments. Any psychiatrist or psychoanalyst who attempted to present documentation indicating that homosexuality was a psychological disorder was shouted down. Some individuals were physically attacked at public forums and threatened with bodily harm at conferences, meetings, and other professional events.²⁰

Eventually their efforts paid off, and in 1972 the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) Task Force on Homosexuality reported that "exclusive heterosexuality and exclusive homosexuality" are "sexual extremes;" and that most people are naturally bisexual. That report certainly influenced the APA's deliberations. To make their own report appear more scientific, however, the Homosexuality Task Force sent out a letter to all members. These letters didn't ask whether or not the members agreed that homosexuality should be "normalized" Rather, they were signed by candidates for the APR's upcoming officers elections, urging members to "vote" that homosexuality should be declared equivalent to heterosexual relations and equally valid.

Nothing in the letters indicated that they had been written and funded by the National Gay Task Force. One of the signers confessed later that admitting the bias of the signers would have been the "kiss of death" for the pro-homosexual vote they were after. But thanks to their long trail of deceit and coercion, the measure passed narrowly, and the 1973 edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of the APA reported that homosexuality would henceforth be referred to by its members as a normal and appropriate sexual orientation.

Not everyone in the APA was so easily persuaded, however. Dr. Henry Reicken cut straight to the heart of the matter in a strongly worded dissent printed in the Appendix to the NIMH report. His statement, under the heading "Detailed Reservations Regarding the Task Force Recommendations on Social Policy;" accused the task force of unprofessional (if not unethical) conduct. He said:

It is as if they "the Task Force" said, "Here is a phenomenon about which we know almost nothing and about which there is a great deal of anxiety and concern; therefore, let us suggest a major revision in public policy for dealing with this phenomenon" I cannot escape the belief that this is an utterly unreasonable conclusion to draw from the sea of ignorance and misinformation in which we find ourselves.²¹

The point was that the sudden reversal of the APA's position on homosexuality was not the result of a scientific study, but a crass political coup pulled off by a gang of conspirators from outside the organization and their willing accomplices on the inside.

In 1977, four years after the APA changed its mind on this critical issue, the journal *Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality* reported that a poll of 2,500 psychiatrists on their view of "current thinking on homosexuality" surprisingly found that fully 69 percent of the respondents agreed that homosexuality is usually "a pathological adaptation as opposed to a normal variation" Less than 20 percent of the respondents to the survey expressed a different opinion.²²

A SHOCKING PROPOSAL

Dr. Charles Socarides is a prominent psychiatrist who does not hesitate to speak openly and honestly to his homosexual patients, and he has helped to chronicle the spread of gay rights in this country over the past forty years. Evidence of the intransigence of many in the movement can be found in the pathology of the disorder. I remember very well Dr. Socarides' comment to me that he was able to cure fully 50 percent of his homosexual patients; 25 percent changed on their own, and the other 25 percent were emotionally unable to overcome the disorder.

Socarides has also written an unflinching analysis of the 1972 APA decision in which he says that the most chilling statement of the homosexual agenda he ever heard was spelled out in shocking detail in a pamphlet called *After the Ball: How America Will Conquer Its Fear and Hatred of Gays* in the 1990s, written by two Harvard-educated sociologists, Marshall Kirk and Hunter Madsen. "That book," he says, "turned out to be the blueprint gay activists would use in their campaign to normalize the abnormal through a variety of brainwashing techniques once catalogued by

Robert Jay Lifton in his seminal work *Thought Reform and the Psychology of Totalism: A Study of Brainwashing in China*.²³

In their disturbingly transparent treatise, Kirk and Madsen describe indoctrination and brainwashing techniques that were used successfully to transform the nation of China into a revolutionary "People's Republic" during the infamous "Cultural Revolution" of the late 1960s. This work was carried out by silencing critics, staging protests and riots, and using every tool of intimidation and violence to overpower their critics. Kirk and Madsen understood how the revolution had been won in China, and they believed that-with enough time, enough money, and enough influence within the media and the popular culture-the homosexual community could force their goals (if not their values) down Americans' throats, whether we liked it or not.

The techniques they prescribed were labeled "desensitization, jamming, and conversion" First of all, they proposed that the homosexual community must desensitize the American people to what homosexuality is all about by spreading the idea that gays are "just like everyone else" Second, they would attempt to shame conscientious resisters and moral conservatives by labeling them as "homophobes" and "bigots" This was what they called jamming. They said:

The trick is to get the bigot into the position of feeling a conflicting twinge of shame.... Thus, propagandistic advertisement can depict homophobic and homohating bigots as crude loudmouths.... It can show them being criticized, hated, shunned. It can depict gays experiencing horrific suffering as the direct result of homohatred-suffering of which even most bigots would be ashamed to be the cause.²⁴

When the process was effective and resisters were effectively silenced, they would achieve what the authors referred to as conversion. Their agenda could be successfully enforced, they reasoned, by keeping up intense pressure on Christians and other moral critics. Eventually, through the combined impact of all these forms of pressure, there would be a "change of heart" in the general population. "Conversion aims at just this;" they wrote, "conversion of the average American's emotions, mind, and will through a planned psychological attack in the form of propaganda fed to the nation via the media."²⁵

If you think that agenda is too outrageous to be real, just look at what has happened over the last thirty years. In 1973, the American Psychiatric Association removed homosexuality from its list of emotional disorders. By the late 1970s, homosexual groups were making major inroads into the largest religious denominations in the country, while dozens of homosexual political action committees formed over the previous decade continued to shake things up on the political scene and to make resistance to

homosexuality in all areas of life a very unpleasant experience.

Between 1972 and 1978, at least forty state legislatures granted "civil rights" to homosexuals comparable to those accorded to ethnic minorities.²⁶ At least twenty states repealed their sodomy laws, and in 2003 the United States Supreme Court, in the case of *Lawrence v. Texas*, ruled the sodomy laws of Texas unconstitutional, forcing by implication all fifty states to take similar action. All across the country, openly gay political candidates have been elected to public office, ranging from local city councils to the United States House of Representatives. And in 2004, the state of Massachusetts and the city of San Francisco, California, both began issuing marriage licenses to same-sex couples. The combined result is that today there is virtually no area of society where homosexuals do not have a highly visible presence.

THE 'GAY RIGHTS' PLATFORM

The 1972 platform of the gay rights movement alerted average Americans to where this issue is headed. The agenda included a program of sweeping changes to virtually all the basic institutions of society. The following objectives were included in the list of demands announced by the Gay and Lesbian Task Force during their March on Washington in 1993:

- Implementation of homosexual, bisexual, and transgendered curriculum at all levels of education.
- Lowering of the age of consent for homosexual and heterosexual sex
- Legalization of homosexual marriages
- Custody, adoption, and foster care rights for homosexuals, lesbians, and transgendered persons
- The redefinition of "family" to include the full diversity of all structured families
- Access to all programs of the Boy Scouts of America
- Affirmative action for homosexuals
- The inclusion of sex-change operations under a universal health-care plan

I will deal with this list of demands in more detail later, but is there any chance that these or any of the other fifty-four demands of homosexual activists will actually be met? Read the headlines. Every day, it seems, another fortress of America's traditional moral values faces the wrecking ball, while judges, juries, and legislators tell us that the values we once took for granted can no longer be invoked. More and more it seems, Christian

virtues are forbidden, while sexual hedonism is everywhere exalted and homosexual behavior may not be challenged.

For most of the last decade, the liberal media have trumpeted the news that researchers have found proof that homosexuality is innate, genetic, and normal behavior within a sizable percentage of the population. In particular, the findings of researchers Simon LeVay and Dean Hamer were held up as irrefutable proof that homosexuality was innate and inborn. News accounts suggested that these new discoveries only confirmed what homosexual activists had been saying for years and proved at last that anyone who objects to homosexuality is bigoted, ignorant, and a danger to society.

The only problem was that their findings, along with their methodology, were imprecise, unorthodox, and chock full of holes. Reports fed to the media were misleading, and the stories they generated were quickly proven false. In the wake of all the sensationalism, researchers at Yale, MIT, Columbia, and the Washington University School of Medicine pointed out the errors in LeVay and Hamer's findings, denying that any of the data or accompanying analysis could substantiate their claim of a so-called "gay gene" Some analysts even said that a proper interpretation of the data would lead to the precise opposite conclusion. But, predictably, evidence indicating that homosexuality is a learned behavior and not a genetic trait went mostly unreported by the media.²⁷

Fortunately, politically correct spin and wishful thinking cannot change the facts. The tactics proposed by Kirk and Madsen have had a profound effect on the culture, but the facts speak for themselves. Homosexuality is an emotional disorder with deep psychological roots, but it is also, despite arguments to the contrary, a learned behavior. Homosexuals have waged a relentless campaign for decades to focus the debate on "rights" instead of "behavior;" but they haven't convinced everyone quite yet.

In the age of civil rights, the gay rights lobby understood that their chances of winning public acceptance would be greater if homosexuals and lesbians were perceived as oppressed minorities rather than as the sexual hedonists they are. The last thing they wanted America to think about was what they actually do behind closed doors.

But not everyone is buying the cover-up. African Americans and Hispanics who have won legitimate civil rights victories since the 1960s have a right to be offended by the claims of the homosexual lobby. Former Secretary of State Colin Powell, expressing opposition to President Clinton's efforts to permit gays to serve in the military, remarked, "Skin color is a benign, non-behavioral characteristic. Sexual orientation is perhaps the most profound of human behavioral characteristics. Comparison of the two is a convenient but invalid argument.'²⁸

The point is well made: skin color is morally neutral and tells nothing about the character of a person. Sexual behavior, on the other hand, has

everything to do with character and tells us a great deal about the person. But these are facts that the homosexual community wants Americans-particularly young Americans-to simply ignore.

A WARNING FROM HISTORY

The gay rights movement has trumpeted its successes, and perhaps that's only fair. They have done the impossible by turning an ancient sin once punishable by death into a celebrated and protected right, practically overnight. But before they celebrate too much, there's one troubling fact of history they ought to consider: namely, the rise and fall of nations. For hundreds of years historians have chronicled the fate of empires, large and small, and the lessons are painfully clear. The excesses of sexual libertinism, combined with social and economic decay, have led to the collapse of great societies since the beginning of time. And America is by no means immune from such a fate.

Empires that once rose to greatness as a direct result of temperance, self-restraint, and obedience to established moral and ethical standards have collapsed in shame and humiliation because they failed to hold firmly enough to the beliefs and values that made them great. The spectacle is sad but true. But will this also be the fate of America? Will this once proud nation, the world's longest surviving constitutional republic and a beacon of liberty to the world for centuries, succumb at last to an excess of the very liberties we have treasured and defended? If you doubt that it could happen here, then you haven't been paying attention.

In his 1979 book, *Our Dance Has Turned to Death*, Christian sociologist Carl Wilson outlines the dangers facing traditional marriage and the family in today's increasingly sexualized culture. Wilson recognized what would happen to the family if American society continues to be tolerant of every sort of sexual perversion, and his analysis was eye-opening.

History reveals that nations decline and eventually die when sexual immorality becomes rampant. If the traditional family is discarded in favor of group sex, homosexuality, infidelity, and unrestrained sexual hedonism, cultural norms cannot survive. In that landmark study, Wilson cited the writings of the great British anthropologist J. D. Unwin, whose 1934 book, *Sex and Culture*, chronicled the decline of dozens of cultures. Looking at the history of some eighty-six different empires of history, Unwin presented some shocking facts, among which was his discovery that no nation that rejected premarital sexual chastity and monogamy in marriage survived longer than a generation after it had embraced sexual hedonism.

Unwin put it this way:

In human records there is no instance of a society retaining its

energy after a complete new generation has inherited a tradition which does not insist on prenuptial and postnuptial continence.²⁹

In other words, premarital sex and sex outside of marriage will destroy the vitality of any civilization.

Very much as the British historian Arnold Toynbee reported in his massive, lifelong research project, *A Study of History*, Unwin saw that nations that valued traditional marriage and sexual abstinence were creative and productive. These cultures flourished. He described it as a cultural energy that could only be maintained so long as sexual activities were restricted to traditional patterns of fidelity within the sacred bonds of marriage.

Russian sociologist Pitirim Sorokin, who authored another classic work in this field, *The American Sex Revolution*, observed much the same thing. In his review of the breakdown of tradition that began in the late 1960s, Sorokin warned that America was in the process of committing "voluntary suicide" through unrestrained sexual indulgence. As individuals began engaging in premarital sex unrelated to marriage, Sorokin predicted with remarkable insight that the birth rate would decline and our nation would begin to be depopulated. He also predicted the inevitable increase in divorce, desertion, and an epidemic of sexual promiscuity resulting in a rise in illegitimate births and abortions. As we now know, those predictions have all come true in the most heartbreaking ways, and society is paying a terrible price.

Sorokin's exhaustive study of decadent cultures convinced him that a healthy society can only survive so long as strong families exist and sexual activities are restricted to marriage. Centuries of solid evidence make the point only too well: sexual promiscuity and a loss of respect for the sanctity of marriage lead inevitably to cultural decline and eventual collapse.

In his research project, Carl Wilson found that decadent cultures display seven distinct characteristics of social and moral change:

1. Men reject spiritual and moral development as the leaders of families.
2. Men begin to neglect their families in search of material gain.
3. Men begin to engage in adulterous relationships or in homosexual sex.
4. Women begin to devalue the role of motherhood and homemaker.
5. Husbands and wives begin to compete with each other, and families disintegrate.
6. Selfish individualism fragments society into warring factions.

7. Men and women lose their faith in God and reject all authority over their lives.

It is not surprising that in such a culture moral anarchy reigns supreme. The loss of religious faith means that virtues such as trust, honor, and respect must fail, and the customs of chastity and selfdenial no longer restrain society's worst impulses. Then, once families begin to collapse, the entire society follows. The point is very simple. George Santayana said it long ago: those who will not learn from history are condemned to repeat it. And, once cultural decline begins, it's almost impossible to turn things around.

PROMISES TO KEEP

In his compelling little book *The Broken Hearth*, former Secretary of Education William Bennett offers a dramatic assessment of America's predicament at this hour:

My concern is that we are now embarked upon an experiment that violates a universal social law: In attempting to raise children without two parents, we are seeing, on a massive scale, the voluntary breakup of the minimal family unit. This is historically unprecedented, an authentic cultural revolution-and, I believe, socially calamitous. We may be under the illusion that we can cheerfully deconstruct marriage and then one day decide to pull back from the brink. But as a friend of mine puts it, once you shoot out the lights, can you shoot them back on again? As the long record of human experimentation attests, civilizations, even great civilizations, are more fragile and perishable than we think.³⁰

If our society is to avoid the disasters that come from such a dangerous shift in the social and moral order, we must strengthen traditional marriage and promote the value of strong families in our schools, our churches, and our homes. We must promote abstinence before marriage and reject attempts to undermine the laws of human nature by redefining marriage to include nonmonogamous couples. To do less would be unthinkable. But in order to empower those who are determined to stand against the tide of moral relativism, we need more and better resources.

Even highly motivated and well-meaning citizens need encouragement to stand up against the tidal wave of popular culture. And we especially need support for our views about marriage, the family, and human sexuality. In a society with a media climate that has become hostile to the Christian religion and traditional values, good intentions aren't enough. We need motivation and inspiration to empower every man, woman, and child to withstand the destructive forces that threaten our nation's survival. And that only comes with a solid faith commitment.

The constant barrage of pro-homosexual programming makes it difficult for young men and women to escape the indoctrination. High-school age and younger children are already damaged by family disintegration, the erotic images of television and the movies, vulgar rock music, a wide-open Internet, and other media that contribute to identity confusion. Some vulnerable children are being catapulted into destructive and desperately unhappy behaviors.³¹

It is not coincidental that, from earliest times, homosexuality has been discouraged. Civilized societies promote traditional families, founded on a lifelong commitment of marriage between a man and a woman, and the bearing and/or adoption of children. The encouragement of family formation has allowed societies to prosper, to reproduce themselves, to avoid sexually transmitted diseases, and to provide healthy nurture and training for future generations. We turn our backs on that sane and responsible model only at our great peril.

This book has been written as an urgent appeal for a return to a safe, sane, and responsible understanding of human sexuality. My purpose throughout these pages is to awaken each reader to the seriousness of the issues. Homosexual activism is at the center of an enormous cultural debate, and I want to make a case for a renewal of morality and self-restraint to restore the foundations of decency throughout American society while there's still time.

On many occasions homosexual activists have said that the only thing standing between them and full acceptance of the homosexual agenda is the Christian activist who believes in the Christian gospel and who holds to biblical standards of right and wrong. Clearly, we are the main target of a massive public relations campaign, and when we come against what the homosexuals stand for, things really start to light up. But that must not deter us.

President Abraham Lincoln reportedly said to a White House guest in 1865, "It is true that you may fool all of the people some of the time; you can even fool some of the people all of the time; but you can't fool all of the people all of the time" Christian morality is under attack in this country as never before, but sooner or later the truth will be visible to everyone, for, indeed, you can't fool all the people all the time. It's with that conviction that I have prepared this work. God is with us, and we will not be silenced.

2

A CAMPAIGN OF DECEPTION

You can forget about trying to persuade the masses that homosexuality is a good thing. But if only you can get them to think that it is just another thing with a shrug of their shoulders, then your battle for legal and social rights is virtually won. And to get to shoulder-shrug stage, gays as a class must cease to appear mysterious, alien, loathsome and contrary. A largescale media campaign will be required in order to change the image of gays in America.¹

-MARSHALL KIRK AND ERASTES PILL, IN "THE
OVERHAULING OF STRAIGHT AMERICA"

FOR AT LEAST the last two thousand years, civilized people have understood the nature of homosexuality and the social, physical, and emotional problems involved. Every great society has condemned it, and the Bible leaves nothing to the imagination. Repeatedly, from Leviticus in the Old Testament to First Corinthians in the New, we are warned of God's judgment of sexual sin and the condemnation upon individuals-and entire nations-that ignore those stern warnings. It's impossible to interpret St. Paul's words any other way: those who willingly indulge in hedonistic sexual activities have no place in God's perfect order (1 Cor. 6:9-10).

The historic, cultural, and religious proscriptions against homosexuality make the point very well that there is simply no grounds for the notion that homosexual practice is a legitimate social good, or that it was ever considered normative in our culture. As I often say when I speak on this topic, "The body parts don't fit!" The male body and the female body were designed to complement one another: they're part of a set with a dynamic and creative purpose. In *The Bible and Homosexual Practice*, author and Bible scholar Dr. Robert A. J. Gagnon points out what's really at stake in the homosexual debate and reminds us of the undeniable fact that "same-sex intercourse constitutes an inexcusable rebellion against the intentional design of the created order."² To confuse the form and function of our bodies, and to misuse them through homosexual intercourse, is not only physical abuse but an act of willful rebellion. Dr. Gagnon goes on to say that:

It degrades the participants when they disregard culture's obvious

clues, and results in destructive consequences for them as well as for society as a whole. These consequences include matters of health (catastrophic rates of disease and shortened life expectancy) and morals (unstable and destabilizing patterns of sexual behavior where short-term and non-monogamous relationships constitute the rule rather than the exception).³

How much clearer could it be? In light of so much history, and with such alarming evidence of social and moral disorder, the attempt to convince people that homosexuality is a reasonable and normal lifestyle would require an act of incomparable deception and a level of cold-hearted calculation almost inconceivable in a civilized world. But that's exactly what the gay rights movement has done. By manipulation of public opinion, by loud and offensive denunciations of their detractors, and by shrewd and deceptive marketing techniques, they have succeeded in changing the attitudes and habits of millions around the world. The result, sadly, is a legacy of shattered lives and broken dreams, all recorded in heartrending detail in the statistics of death, disease, and emotional dysfunction within the homosexual community.

So how did all this happen? How could so many be so deceived? By almost any measure, the twentieth century was one of the bloodiest in all of human history. Not just because of the tragedy of war and rumors of war, but also for the sheer human toll exacted by tyrants, butchers, and despots of every description. In that one century we witnessed the ravages of Adolf Hitler, Josef Stalin, Mao Zedong, Tojo Hideki, Pol Pot, Idi Amin, Nicolae Ceausescu, and Saddam Hussein and the massacres in Biafra, Rwanda, Sudan, and many more. By some estimates, no fewer than 175 million men, women, and children were killed in the carnage of that century.

The moral and spiritual fallout of those turbulent years has been profound. The impact of two world wars, coming practically back-to-back, was felt most strongly in Europe, where millions have apparently given up on God. In some places in that part of the world, belief in traditional values seems to have disappeared altogether. But America has been affected too, and we must never forget that this was also the century of Margaret Sanger, the outspoken leader of the eugenics movement who founded Planned Parenthood, and of Harry Blackmun, the Supreme Court justice who manipulated the Constitution and the Court in order to create, with no moral or legal justification, "a woman's right to choose" to abort her unborn child. By some estimates, as many as forty-five million innocent children have died in that holocaust so far, and the toll continues to mount.

THE GREATEST OF LIARS

The twentieth century was also the era of Alfred Kinsey, the professor of zoology at Indiana University who is celebrated today by pornographers,

pederasts, and perverts everywhere as the father of the "Sexual Revolution" Who knows how many more lives will ultimately be lost to AIDS, sexually transmitted diseases (STDs), cancer, suicide, and all the other horrors of disease, disability, and death that Kinsey's fraudulent research on human sexuality has unleashed upon mankind?

Of all the deceivers who ever violated the social order and corrupted the human spirit, none has done greater damage than Alfred Kinsey. From start to finish, Kinsey's life work was a fabric of lies: the product of an embittered and perverted mind, invented to satisfy his own sordid lusts. His research methods and published findings violated the most basic standards of his own profession. Far from being objective, Kinsey knew before he ever began his studies what he wanted the data to say, and he skewed his findings to get the exact results he had in mind.

Kinsey and the graduate students who assisted him did not use conventional sampling techniques, but selected informants for their study who were (in dramatically large numbers) either incarcerated sex offenders, pedophiles, homosexuals, or prostitutes. Kinsey's young assistant, Clyde Martin, admitted that he had no training in statistics and was utterly unqualified for the tasks he was given. But when challenged to add a qualified statistician to his team by the Ford Foundation, who was funding the projects, Kinsey adamantly refused. Furthermore, he refused to allow competent researchers to examine his data, his interview techniques, his methodology, or his calculations. And the reason is perfectly clear: Kinsey had an agenda, and transparency was the last thing he wanted.

The son of a Methodist minister, Kinsey rejected his father's religion as a child and was a lifelong atheist, a homosexual, a sexual exhibitionist, and a pedophile.⁴ During his undergraduate studies at Bowdoin College, and later at Harvard, he volunteered as a Scout leader in order to gain access to young boys. Accounts of his conquests, his voyeurism, his perverse exhibitionism, and his fascination with pornography and masturbation-all now part of the public record-are too sordid to describe here. But these things certainly cast a somber light on Kinsey's work as a "scientist" and help to explain why his two most infamous books aroused such shock and dismay in the 1940s and 1950s.

I was in the eighth grade when Kinsey's first book appeared, but I remember very well the public reaction when his findings came out. It was shocking. *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (1948) was followed by *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female* (1952), and everyone I knew was scandalized by it. No one really understood what this man was saying, but shocking rumors were whispered in corners, and we knew these books were going to shake things up.

Among his many disturbing pronouncements, Kinsey concluded that 10 percent of the U.S. population was homosexual, all or part of the time. When my mother read about that in the *Washington Post*, she sat me down

one afternoon and said, "Louis, you let me know if any man ever approaches you in an inappropriate way." It was perfectly clear that America was not ready to accept homosexuality at that time, but Kinsey had opened Pandora's box, and all the evils of mankind were being loosed upon the world. By the mid-fifties it was clear that something terrible was happening to American society.

To this day, the Kinsey Institute at Indiana University continues to burnish the reputation of its founder and to propagate specious studies of human sexuality. The Institute still refuses to reveal their sources of data or their research methods. The first rule of scientific inquiry is that no study can be deemed authoritative unless it can be replicated and validated by other scientists working in a reasonably similar environment. But Alfred Kinsey was so averse to public scrutiny that he once said he would destroy all his files and go to jail before he would let outsiders see any of them.⁵ And the Kinsey Institute still operates in much the same manner.

Kinsey's assertion that 10 percent of the population is homosexual was undoubtedly his most controversial and most unsubstantiated claim. Many studies over the last forty years have found no grounds for it. The best estimates of the actual occurrence of homosexuality, in both the male and female population, have never been higher than 2 percent.⁶ Yet Kinsey's false claim has become the loudest boast of the gay rights movement and a pillar of the sex-education movement in America's public schools.

Gershon Legman, who was the researcher that compiled Kinsey's pornography collection, revealed in his 1964 book about erotic literature that Kinsey's whole purpose in creating the "10 percent myth" was to "respectabilize" homosexuality, fornication, and other stigmatized practices.⁷ In order to bolster his own misleading reports and to undercut anyone who might object, Kinsey even claimed that the Holy See, at the Vatican, maintains the largest archive of pornography and erotic literature in the world. Investigators quickly discounted those claims, but Kinsey refused to recant, and he continued to promote that baseless charge for years.⁸

At the height of public reaction to Kinsey's spurious findings, Dr. Abraham Maslow, a highly regarded psychologist and researcher at Brandeis University, best known for his work on "self actualization," demonstrated conclusively that the large number of sex offenders, prostitutes, and other volunteers that Kinsey had used in his study would skew the results and lead to seriously flawed conclusions. But Kinsey not only ignored Maslow's assertions, he also abruptly ended their long friendship.

In their landmark study of Kinsey and his claims, Dr. Judith Reisman and Edward W. Eichel concluded, "Kinsey's human sexuality research may be the most egregious example of scientific deception in this century."⁹ In their examination of eight separate studies conducted by reliable social scientists, these authors determined that the actual incidence of homosexuality in this

country is no more than 1 to 2 percent.

NO TRUTH IN THE TIMES

Despite the work of Reisman, Eichel, and others who have uncovered the hidden secrets of Dr. Kinsey's world, the damage to the culture has already been done. Over the last twenty years there have been scores of groundbreaking books, journal articles, magazine features, and newspaper accounts outlining the flaws in Kinsey's work, including the horror of his sexual experiments with children and even infants. But, sadly, Kinsey's message came at a time when the American culture was in transition, and there were some who wanted nothing more than a Sexual Revolution, with unrestricted sexual license and a repudiation of Christian morality.

For Hollywood, the music industry, and the mass media, the Sexual Revolution was a bonanza. And for many in that world, homosexuality is not just a matter of "rights" but a cause celebre. Instead of unbiased treatment of the genuine risks and dangers associated with sexual promiscuity and the "gay lifestyle," many in the liberal media aggressively defend sexual license and excoriate those who would dare to point out the lies and hypocrisy that prop up their agenda. The film *Kinsey*, which starred actor Liam Neeson, was merely Hollywood's most recent attempt to resurrect the reputation of this pathetic figure.

Such people still use Kinsey's research to defend homosexuality, and they use the gay agenda, in turn, as a ramrod to transform the culture. Following in the wake of the homosexual movement are all the other movements that have been built on that foundation of lies. And that's really what it boils down to: men and women with a deep hatred for our Judeo-Christian roots believe that if they can simply break down our moral resolve on this issue, then everything else will follow. To see how this plays out in contemporary society, just consider what has happened to the news media over the last twenty years.

There may be no better example of the media's bias against moral absolutes than the case of Pinch Sulzberger, who was an outspoken advocate for homosexuals in the newsroom from the day he first joined the staff of his father's newspaper, the *New York Times*, in 1984. Despite profound misgivings about his young heir, Arthur Sulzberger Sr. nevertheless gave his son, Arthur Jr. (nicknamed "Pinch"), control of the media giant in 1997. And what has happened since then? In a candid admission in July 2004, the paper's ombudsman had to confess that the *Times'* coverage of homosexuality is more like "cheerleading" than objective reporting. What the ombudsman didn't say was that homosexuals now make up fully 75 percent of the editorial board that decides what stories to report and how they're reported by the *Times*.¹⁰

In the powerful new book *Libel* by the New York Times, attorney J. Edward Pawlick says the Times "is personally managed by its latest chairman, who is using his power to further his personal agenda of imposing 'gay marriage' nationwide..."¹¹ Hardly a worthy goal for a periodical renowned as the nation's "paper of record" But Ed Pawlick knows what he's talking about. In the aftermath of the Massachusetts Supreme Court's 2003 decision allowing gay marriage in that state, Ed Pawlick and his wife, Sally, led a citizen group that collected 130,000 signatures for an amendment to overturn the court's outrageous ruling. Predictably, the New York Times and its satellite publication, the Boston Globe, weighed in on the other side of the issue and pressured lawmakers to skip the vote, thereby silencing the voice of the people. Which they effectively did.

Even though a vote was required by Massachusetts law, the citizens' initiative was killed there, and the liberal media applauded loudly. Pinch Sulzberger and company weren't concerned about objective journalism or constitutional principles-they were too busy shaping the way America thinks. The goal was to defeat moral limits on sexual libertinism in general and homosexuality in particular. But Ed Pawlick's response was precise: "Gay marriage didn't just happen in Massachusetts;" he writes in his book. "It was engineered by the Times."¹² And that is the paper's focus today: vigorously promoting the gay agenda and then gloating when they receive awards from organizations like the Gay & Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation (GLAAD), as they did recently, praising the Times for its "outstanding coverage overall"

THE LAVENDER MAFIA

While the Times maybe the highest profile purveyor of pro-homosexual propaganda, they are by no means the only ones. The National Lesbian and Gay Journalists Association national conference, as reported in September 2000, was funded by media conglomerates such as the Hearst newspaper chain, Knight-Ridder, CBS News, the Gannett Foundation, CNN, NBC News, Bloomberg News, Fox News Network, the Los Angeles Times, New York Daily News, the Dallas Morning News, and the San Francisco Chronicle, among others.¹³

Attending the conference were such influential reporters and media figures as Paula Madison, vice president of diversity at NBC and news director for WNBC in New York; CBS News correspondent Jeffrey Kofman; and Ramon Escobar, an MSNBC producer. During one panel discussion, these "objective journalists" argued against presenting alternative viewpoints about the issue of homosexuality. Jeffrey Kofman said, "Why do we constantly see in coverage of gay and lesbian, bisexual and transgender issues the homophobes and the fag-haters quoted in stories when, of course, we don't do that with Jews, blacks, et cetera?"¹⁴ And Paula Madison concurred: "I agree with him. I don't see why we would seek out ... the absurd, inane point of view just to get another point of view."¹⁵ So much for

fair and balanced coverage.

Members of the National Lesbian and Gay Journalists Association hold high level positions at newspapers and broadcast organizations from coast to coast, and they aggressively censor the news each day to make sure that one, and only one, point of view is given credible coverage. According to the association's Web site, major participants in previous national conferences have included media superstars such as Leslie Stahl, Katie Couric, Dan Rather, Peter Jennings, Tom Brokaw, George Stephanopoulos, and, no surprise, Linda Ellerbee.¹⁶ These are the people who determine what you will see and read about in the mainstream news. Is it any wonder that millions of Americans are tuning out and turning off the networks, looking instead to talk radio, the Fox News Channel, or the Internet, where objective reporting still exists?

How things have changed. In the fifties and sixties we had TV shows like *Leave It to Beaver*, *Ozzie and Harriet*, and *Father Knows Best*, all of which offered positive portrayals of family life and real moral values. But little by little, Hollywood ditched the ethical approach and turned its attentions in a very different direction. The first network program to feature a homosexual character in an ongoing role was the soap opera *One Life to Live* in 1992. By 1999, there were twentyfive sitcoms or daytime dramas with homosexual characters. Without exception, these characters were portrayed as witty, clever, lovable, and just a little quirky.

It's perfectly clear what the Hollywood writers and producers were doing—grinding away at public morality, using comedy as a vehicle to overcome the natural resistance of adults, and playing on the curiosity and credulity of children. By sheer persistence, the gay-friendly media have been forcing Americans to accept homosexuality as a normal and natural choice, whether they believe it or not.

The media conspiracy to subvert the morals of children became painfully apparent in January 2005 when several major children's television shows joined with the We Are Family Foundation to promote the homosexual agenda under the guise of teaching children "tolerance and diversity." Among the TV characters taking part were such kiddie favorites as Arthur, Barney, Bob the Builder, Dora the Explorer, and Jimmy Neutron. The characters all sang together, "We Are Family," and kids were directed to the Web site of the pro-homosexual We Are Family Foundation, which teaches them to accept and celebrate differences of race, class, gender, and "sexual identity."

The cartoon feature aired on the Disney Channel, Nickelodeon, and PBS on March 11, 2005, and was supposed to be shown to kids in sixty-one thousand schools all across the country. Each child was to be given a workbook designed by the very liberal, very pro-homosexual Anti-Defamation League (ADL). Can somebody say "brainwashing" here? There's no question what was really going on. And to top it off, children were being

urged to visit a Web site where they could sign the "Tolerance Pledge;" which promises to respect all people whose "abilities, beliefs, culture, race, sexual identity, or other characteristics are different from my own"

PIED PIPERS OF HOLLYWOOD

There's no limit to how low some of these organizations will go, using technology, comedy, and entertainment, to wrest control of children's minds and emotions away from parents. The children's network Nickelodeon was promoting homosexuality as a normal lifestyle choice in 2002, when liberal commentator Linda Ellerbee hosted a program called *My Family Is Different*. To promote the acceptability of same-sex "families;" Ellerbee featured a homosexual school principal, a homosexual New York fire fighter, the lesbian entertainer Rosie O'Donnell, and several children who were being raised in homosexual homes. Of the thirteen individuals featured on the program, only three teenagers spoke against homosexuality. The rest were all for it.

Of course, the program was produced with input from the Gay, Lesbian, Straight Education Network (GLSEN), Gay & Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation (GLAAD), Parents and Friends of Lesbians and Gays, and other pro-homosexual groups. It was a set piece from start to finish: a pro-homosexual snow job worthy of Adolf Hitler's propaganda chief, Leni Riefenstahl. Unfortunately, Nickelodeon isn't the only player promoting the homosexual agenda. Networks such as PBS, "E" the Entertainment Network, the Disney Channel, Home and Garden TV, the Food Network, A&E, and the Discovery Channel-not to mention the hard-rock channels MTV and VH1-all feature homosexuals in positive roles. Among the young crowd today, it's cool to be gay, and Hollywood is leading the way.

For several years Hollywood has been under the thumb of a group of writers, producers, and directors known as the "Lavender Mafia," which is an informal network of homosexuals and gay-friendly movers and shakers. These are the people who produce many of the programs our children see on TV and in the movies. Among them are people like Kevin Williamson, the producer of TV's *Dawson's Creek* and the *Scream* film series; Jenny Bicks, a gay activist who has written for *Sex and the City* on HBO and *Leap of Faith* on NBC; Craig Zadan and Neil Meron, who worked on *Gypsy* with Bette Midler, and then collaborated with Glenn Close and Barbra Streisand on the pro-homosexual film, *Serving in Silence: The Margarethe Cammermeyer Story*. They also helped create the program *What Makes a Family?*, a pro-homosexual film for the Lifetime cable channel.

David Geffen, a partner at DreamWorks, the production company founded by Stephen Spielberg, was producer of the film *American Beauty*, which presented a dismal image of heterosexual marriage and a very positive portrayal of homosexuality. This film was written by homosexual

screenwriter Alan Ball and produced by Dan Jinks and Bruce Cohen, both homosexuals. But perhaps the most flagrant and dangerous indoctrination has come not from the world of the "R-rated" and adult films but from the place you would have least expected-the "Wonderful World of Disney."

THE OTHER EVIL EMPIRE

Walt Disney once said that, "'To captivate our varied and worldwide audience of all ages, the nature and treatment of the fairy tale, the legend, the myth, has to be elementally simple. Good and evil, the antagonists of all great drama in some guise," he said, "must be believably personalized."¹⁷ Little did he know that one day those words would take shape, not just in his studio's pictures and cartoons, but in the boardroom of the organization he created.

It's no longer a secret that Disney's once fabled empire of childfriendly films, cartoons, theme parks, merchandising, and related ventures is now in the grasp of the homosexual agenda, but it is nevertheless one of the saddest and most disappointing aspects of this story. Disney chairman Michael Eisner and Joe Roth, chairman of Walt Disney Motion Pictures, have both served on the board of a group called Hollywood Supports, which is a homosexual lobbying organization founded by Barry Diller of the Home Shopping Network and Sid Sheinberg of MCA/Universal to advocate for homosexual benefits in the film industry and to influence public opinion, in all areas, regarding homosexuality.

Elizabeth Birch, a lesbian activist and former executive director of the Human Rights Campaign, reported to participants at the Aspen Human Rights Summit in Colorado on a brief conversation she'd had with Michael Eisner. When she encountered Eisner at a meeting, she said, she told him, "Michael, 30 percent of your employees are gay." To which Eisner said, "You're wrong, Elizabeth. It's 40 percent!"¹⁸ Obviously, he was well aware of what was going on, and some recent estimates have suggested the actual total may be even higher.

A decade ago, a feature story in Buzz magazine entitled "Disney Comes Out of the Closet" chronicled the conversion of Disney under Eisner's leadership into a fortress of gay culture and the foremost promoter of homosexuality to America's children.¹⁹ Tom Schumacher, who was president of Walt Disney Feature Animation and the man who oversaw production of the animated film *The Lion King*, is an outspoken homosexual. Another gay executive at Disney, Lauren Lloyd, produced the film *Boys Town*, which was a 2002 Disney feature dealing with the murder of a homosexual in West Hollywood.

So why would a child-friendly organization like Disney go to such lengths to support the gay agenda? As the old saying goes, follow the money. As one

analyst puts it, "Homosexuals are a wealthy and identityconscious consumer group, and Disney knows it"²⁰ The large number of films, cartoons, books, television features, and theme-park spectaculars with gay characters and themes has given this cash-hungry company a massive following in the gay community. Some studies show that homosexuals are more than three times as likely as the general population to see two or more movies a month, and their influence at Disney Studios is immense.

This plays to Disney's financial interests, of course. And the open, welcoming environment at Disney World and other theme parks that feature "Gay and Lesbian Day" each year only helps to increase loyalty among the homosexual crowd. Never mind that it also alienates millions of Christian families and contributes to the deterioration of moral standards for everyone. The moguls at Disney believe they can overcome the resistance of parents and moral opponents in the community by powerful advertising aimed at children, and, by all accounts, the gamble is working just fine.

But the toxic waste spewing from Disney doesn't stop there. Another Disney subsidiary, Hyperion Press, promotes homosexuality in America's bookstores with publications aimed at "the homosexual children of heterosexual parents" One such example was Hyperion's 1995 publication *Growing Up Gay*, written by comedians Jaffe Cohen, Danny McWilliams, and Bob Smith and designed to help kids adjust to homosexuality. Hyperion has also published an autobiography of the transvestite entertainer RuPaul and a series of "self-help" guides for parents and their troubled teens.

In a book entitled *Tinker Belles and Evil Queens*, author Sean Griffin chronicles the transformation of the Disney organization by describing how the company's vision changed after the death of its founder, Walt Disney. Griffin begins with the early days and how the homosexual connection began; then he examines the degree to which "gay culture" now pervades everything Disney does. Although the author speaks of these changes in generally favorable terms, he nevertheless reveals how homosexuals have co-opted Disney's cartoon characters, films, parks, and other products for their own purposes, and how they've manipulated the images of Mickey Mouse and the Magic Kingdom to insinuate homosexuality into every American home.²¹

LIVE AND LET LIVE?

Some might argue that the transformation of Hollywood and the news media that I've just described is a good thing. Those who favor the idea of "Live and let live!" may even believe that it's only fair to include and encourage gays and lesbians, to give them a role in organizations like Disney and others where they can make a positive contribution. Though well meaning, that view misses the point entirely. The homosexual agenda has nothing to do with making a positive contribution. Furthermore, gay rights activists will

never settle for a "live and let live" role. Their goal is to enforce acceptance and legitimization of their lifestyle and to overpower and overwhelm by sheer force anyone who dares to stand in their way.

Does anyone doubt that? Then take a look at what homosexuals have said about their own game plan. Homosexual activists have a strategic marketing plan to promote homosexuality and to vilify their enemies. That plan was published in Guide magazine in November 1987, and it makes for some pretty eye-opening reading. In "The Overhauling of Straight America," homosexual activists Marshall Kirk and Erastes Pill describe several strategies that homosexuals can use to push their way onto center stage. For example:

- Talk about gays and gayness as loudly and as often as possible.
- Portray gays as victims, not as aggressive challengers.
- Give protectors a just cause.
- Make gays look good.
- Make the victimizers look bad.²²

To make those who object to the homosexual lifestyle look bad, they say, homosexuals are to use words, images, and slurs that compare opponents to the Nazis, Klan members, and ignorant "homophobes" The object is not to convince or persuade, but to destroy their opponents by linking them to racists and "right-wing crazies" A publication we produced at the Traditional Values Coalition, called "Homosexual Propaganda Campaign Based on Hitler's 'Big Lie' Technique," goes into detail about this type of campaign and how "hate speech" is used against Christians and others who oppose the normalization of sodomy.

This is what it's really all about-deception, misdirection, coercion, and brute force when necessary, and, above all, perpetuating the "Big Lie" that homosexuality is a natural "lifestyle alternative" and that those who oppose it are to be branded as intolerable bigots. As Marshall Kirk and Erastes Pill prescribe:

Portray gays as victims, not as aggressive challengers. In any campaign to win over the public, gays must be cast as victims in need of protection so that straights will be inclined by reflex action to assume the role of protector.... Straight viewers must be able to identify with gays as victims. Mr. and Mrs. Public must be given no extra excuses to say 'they are not like us'... Our campaign should not demand direct support for homosexual practices, but should instead take antidiscrimination as its theme.²

3

You can be certain this is not merely a passive campaign of resistance. It

is above all an aggressive campaign to demonize opponents of the gay agenda. Case in point: Kirk and Pill write:

Make the victimizers look bad.... The public should be shown images of ranting homophobes whose secondary traits and beliefs disgust middle America. These images might include: the Ku Klux Klan demonstrating that gays be burned alive or castrated; bigoted southern ministers drooling with hysterical hatred to a degree that looks both comical and deranged; menacing pugs, thugs, and convicts speaking coolly about the 'fags' they have killed or would like to kill; a tour of Nazi concentration camps where homosexuals were tortured and gassed.²⁴

There is nothing benign here, no reasonable disagreement, no respect for the opinions or moral reservations of those who have expressed concern for the dismantling of our culture. Rather, what's being presented here is a plan for combat and the conquest of a nation.

In a report entitled "Special Class Protections for Self-Alleged Gays: A Question of 'Orientation' and Consequences," the founder of Colorado for Family Values, Anton V. Marco, makes the logical connection between the words of the pamphleteers and their even more sinister precursors who masterminded the tyrannies of the last century. The words, tactics, and attitudes expressed in the manifesto written by Kirk and Pill, says Marco, bear a striking resemblance to those of a directive of the Communist Party USA that was quoted in the 1956 "Report of the House of Representatives Committee on Un-American Activities;" which said in part:

Members and front organizations must continually embarrass, discredit and degrade our critics.... When obstructionists become too irritating, label them as fascist or Nazi or anti-Semitic.... Constantly associate those who oppose us with those names that already have a bad smell. The association will, after enough repetition, become "fact" in the public mind (Volume I, p. 347).²⁵

The message of both documents is the same. Furthermore, the tactics are the same. And gay rights activists have learned this lesson well, as illustrated by an incident in Colorado cited by Marco. In the early 1990s, Christians and other concerned citizens were urged to stay away from a city's "Gay Day Parade." They were urged to "Boycott Gay Day." At the same time, however, promoters of the homosexual event had taken a very aggressive position in the media, warning about the possibility of violence from "right wingers" Most of the local population, in fact, stayed away from the event, and the demonstrators ended up marching down virtually empty streets, with no evidence of protest or resistance of any kind.

But did this silence the homosexual activists' claims that they were victims of violence? Of course not. Despite the total absence of so-called

"gay bashing" or dissent at the parade or anywhere else that day, spokesmen for the event told the sympathetic news media that they were victims of Colorado's hate mongers, KKKers, neo-Nazis, and other right-wing bigots. They weren't interested in telling the truth or protecting themselves. Their object was to portray themselves as victims, as Kirk and Pill had prescribed, and to demonize their opponents.

BEYOND ALL MORAL LIMITS

The reality of what the homosexual bullying tactics were meant to accomplish was revealed in an article published in the gay tabloid the Washington Blade a short time later. In an article by Eric Pollard, who was the founder of the confrontational homosexual group, ACT UP / DC, we find the following confession:

I have helped to create a truly fascist organization.... The decision to create ACT UP / DC was conceived when I and another early member attended an OUT! rally. I had taken copious amounts of LSD. We were impressed with the energy and with the self-righteous anger of the crowd. We conspired to bring into existence an activist group that ... could effectively exploit the media for its own ends, and that would work covertly and break the law with impunity.... Under the influence of powerful, illicit drugs, it really seemed like a good idea .²⁶

Furthermore, Pollard revealed that the group had adopted "subversive modes, drawn largely from the voluminous *Mein Kampf* (the book by Adolf Hitler that describes how he seized power in Germany in the 1930s), which some of us studied as a working model. As ACT UP / DC grew, we struck intently and surgically into whatever institution we believed to stand in our way..."²⁷

Then at one point in the article, Pollard admits, "I have left ACT UP, more correctly, they have thrown me out for insisting on the viability of individual dissent"²⁸ These are strange admissions, as Tony Marco points out, for the homosexual movement that has made a living by accusing moral opponents of using Nazi tactics. But, again, this is all part of what Hitler had called "the big lie" If you tell a big lie, tell it often, and repeat it boldly enough, people will begin to believe it-and the bigger the lie the better.

What matters to the propagandist is that his tactics will allow him to overwhelm and defeat the opponent. Truth is not only not the issue in such a campaign of deception, but truth is also the enemy. "Propaganda must not serve the truth," Hitler wrote, "especially not insofar as it might bring out something favorable for the opponent." And this is obviously why Eric Pollard and his ACT UP companions found Hitler's advice so applicable to their own efforts. The idea is to change the debate, to humiliate and

discredit the adversary, and to create an entirely new reality based on lies. Once again, Hitler's words say it very well: "Through clever and constant application of propaganda, people can be made to see paradise as hell, and also the other way round, to consider the most wretched sort of life as paradise "29

I will be the first to say that these descriptions of the homosexual agenda and the renewed importance of principled resistance to it are not always an easy message to deliver, but it is a message I can by no means fail to deliver at this critical hour in our nation's history. When all's said and done, I don't want to be guilty of the sin of omission, and I'm convinced that God will hold us all accountable if we don't have the courage to stand up and challenge the "big lie" and to vocally and physically resist the wickedness that is invading our culture.

FACING THE FACTS

The tactics of deception that I've described in these pages are part of a gradual softening process designed to wear down the natural resistance of regular Americans. But beyond that, it is part of a sophisticated social and political campaign that threatens immeasurable damage to our nation if we fail to stand our ground.

What's really at stake in allowing homosexuality to become a "viable lifestyle alternative;" as they phrase it, is that the homosexual agenda is a denial of God's creative order. It is a rejection of the obvious truth of Genesis 1 and 2. When you remove the pristine doctrine of Creation and the incredible work that was done there by the Creator God, then the rest of Scripture can be taken tongue in cheek. If Genesis 1:26 is not a fact-that God made us both male and female, created in the likeness of His own image-then nothing is true, and we're all in trouble. To deny the Creation account and its meaning for maintaining an orderly and moral society is like denying God's plan of redemption merely to satisfy some notion of political correctness being pushed by the homosexual community, and that would be unthinkable.

For much of the last century, homosexual activists and their friends have been pushing the idea that homosexuality is a normal, and even desirable, lifestyle choice. Their papers and magazines say they were "born that way;" but there's no reliable science to support that claim. In fact, most homosexuals don't believe that their orientation is genetic and inborn. In that regard, it's only fair to point to a survey administered by Alfred Kinsey in 1970 based on a questionnaire administered to a group of 979 homosexuals about this question. Even Kinsey came closer to the truth than today's propagandists. What he found in that study was that less than 10 percent of respondents believed they were "born that way." And more than 80 percent attributed their orientation to childhood trauma or other

environmental influences. Here's what they said:³⁰

Reasons Given for Orientation	Percent
Early homosexual experience with adults or peers	22%
Around homosexuals a lot, have a lot of homosexual friends	16%
Poor relationship with mother	15%
Poor relationship with father	14%
Unusual development (labeled sissy, tomboy, etc.)	15%
Heterosexual partners unavailable	12%
Social ineptitude	9%
I was born that way	9%

What the medical community is discovering about homosexuality and the incidence of disease and premature death among gay men and lesbians offers a somber contrast to the images put forth by the homosexual lobby. But no amount of hype and disinformation can change the fact that, while there are genuine psychological and emotional factors involved, homosexuality is a learned behavior and ultimately a choice-not an inborn biological condition. And homosexuals themselves know this. It's just another example of their campaign of deception.

3

A PUBLIC HEALTH DISASTER

Debilitating illness, chronic disease, psychological problems, and early death suffered by homosexuals is the legacy of this tragically misguided activism, which puts the furthering of an "agenda" above saving the lives of those whose interests they purport to represent. Those who advocate full acceptance of homosexual behavior choose to downplay the growing and incontrovertible evidence regarding the serious, life-threatening health effects associated with the homosexual lifestyle.¹

-DR. TIMOTHY J. DAILEY

WHAT'S LOVE GOT to do with it?" When Tina Turner recorded that hit song back in 1984, she was only putting into words what many young Americans had apparently already concluded. Based on the loose morals and broken lives of a "no-fault divorce, anything goes" culture, love was just a secondhand emotion. In her song, Turner said that if there could be a broken heart, then one should just skip all the formalities and take pleasure wherever you find it-self-indulgent hedonism and low-risk "hook-ups" were the answer. Those were the ethics of a bruised and battered generation. Earlier, as America entered the strung-out seventies, songwriter Stephen Stills put it even more bluntly in his song "Love the One You're With;" which told listeners to love whomever they were with if they couldn't be with the one they loved.

What a sad epitaph for modern civilization. In God's perfect order, sexual intimacy has always been reserved for marriage. The union of man and wife produces life. It's an expression of divine unity. The two become "one flesh," and the consummation of human love as it was meant to be includes the promise of a lifetime commitment of love, fidelity, and accountability. But whenever God's natural order is scorned, and wherever mere hedonism and sexual license are allowed to prevail, chaos inevitably ensues. It's a law of nature as certain as thunder and lightning: promiscuity and infidelity lead to brokenness, unhappiness, suffering, and death.

When you look at the statistics of the "free love" movement from the sixties right up to our time, what you will discover is a heartbreaking chronicle of damaged lives, deadly diseases, and a level of cultural confusion and emotional despair that is unprecedented in history. And no component

of this breakdown of the moral order is more conspicuous or more dangerous to our future than unrestrained dissipation and the aberrant sexual recklessness of the homosexual movement.

FACTS DON'T LIE

Here are some of the troubling medical facts. In 1993 and 1994, Dr. Paul Cameron conducted an important study of the mortality rates of homosexuals. He recorded the age of death for homosexuals as reported in death notices of eighteen homosexual journals over an eleven-year period, and what he found was that the median age of death was the late thirties for those with acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS). For those who had not developed AIDS, the median age of death was only slightly longer, in their early forties. Statistics for lesbians indicated an average life span of less than fifty years. At the end of the study, Cameron concluded:

Our results suggest that AIDS has reduced the homosexual life-span by about 3 to 5 years, making homosexuality appreciably more dangerous today than in the past [if we assume an average age of death of 42 before AIDS, then AIDS is associated with a 7% to 12% reduction in life-span].²

Evidently long life is not much of a factor in the homosexual "lifestyle" But what makes these results all the more disturbing is the fact that longevity has been on the rise in the general population in this country for most of the last century. Life expectancy for males has increased from about forty years in the mid-nineteenth century to more than seventy-five years today. For females, life expectancy is now at least seventy-nine years for those with normal health and lifestyles, and even longer if the individual has already reached middle age.³

By any measure, homosexuals and lesbians have a substantially shorter life expectancy than heterosexuals. Another study released in 2004 suggests that young men who engage in homosexual relations before age twenty are unlikely to reach retirement age.⁴ The incidence of not just AIDS and HIV, but also of more than thirty highly infectious sexually transmitted diseases in this group, has reduced life expectancy by as much as thirty years. And "quality of life" for practicing homosexuals is practically nonexistent whenever symptoms of illness and disease are detected.

A study published in the International Journal of Epidemiology on the mortality rates of homosexuals in Canada, as just one example, concluded that life expectancy for gay and bisexual men is eight to twenty years less than for other men. If current patterns continue, the researchers said: "We estimate that nearly half of gay and bisexual men currently aged twenty years will not reach their sixty-fifth birthday. Under even the most liberal assumptions;" scientists added, "gay and bisexual men in this urban centre

are now experiencing a life expectancy similar to that experienced by all men in Canada in the year 1871." ⁵

What all this tells us is that just 2 percent of homosexual men will ever reach old age, defined as age sixty-five or older. Even when AIDS is not present, fewer than 12 percent of homosexual men will ever reach old age. Even Alfred Kinsey's research in the 1930s and '40s, although he strongly supported homosexual and lesbian relationships personally, indicated that fewer than 1 percent of homosexuals could expect to live to age sixty-five or older. ⁶

Paul Cameron's studies of life expectancy among homosexuals reveal that the average life span for lesbians is only slightly higher than that of homosexual men. Life expectancy for lesbians is approximately age fifty if neither HIV nor AIDS is present, and age forty-five if either disease is present. But it should also be noted that longevity figures like these are not the only things that ought to trouble the promoters of the homosexual "lifestyle."

Homosexual relationships are also highly unstable and emotionally charged. Physical abuse is at least twice as high among gays as it is among heterosexual couples. But such facts are ignored by the media and the homosexual culture. I have often said that homosexuals are not merely men and women who prefer the same sex, but people who are "pansexual" In other words, they are people who seek sexual gratification in any place and by any means available to satisfy their erotic desires. They are hedonists in the truest sense of the word, and longstanding monogamous relationships are the last thing most homosexuals want. This is just one more reason why the whole idea of "gay marriage" is such a fraud.

A 1978 study revealed that 28 percent of homosexual men have had a thousand or more sexual partners. Fully 79 percent of individuals surveyed said that more than half of their sex partners were strangers. Just under 50 percent of white homosexual males said they had as many as five hundred sex partners. ⁷ A separate study of AIDS victims by the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) revealed that about eleven hundred sexual partners was the average for most homosexuals, while some men estimated that they'd had as many as twenty thousand partners in their lifetimes. ⁸ Such figures are simply staggering, but that's not the worst of it.

Since the AIDS contagion was first diagnosed in 1985, the rate of infection has skyrocketed to more than sixteen thousand new cases every day of the year. ⁹ If you wonder how this is possible, you only need to consider what's happening in today's homosexual culture. Patient zero of the worldwide AIDS epidemic, according to the findings of epidemiologists, was a Canadian flight attendant named Gaetan Dugas who traveled almost exclusively internationally. As an active and promiscuous homosexual, Dugas passed the AIDS virus to anonymous partners around the globe. It

would not be stretching the truth by much to say that every man or woman who had engaged in homosexual relations over the past thirty years is, by implication at least, connected in a morbidly frightening way to Gaetan Dugas.

What all this should tell us is that there's nothing "gay" about the homosexual lifestyle. To try to persuade the American people that this "deathstyle" is somehow worthy of protection and promotion is a fraud of tragic proportions, and frankly, it is the most diabolical campaign of deception I can imagine.

A TROUBLED PAST

The history of the homosexual movement is a long and inglorious affair. As I indicated in the first chapter, there have been homosexual cliques in this country since the eighteenth century, motivated in part by the spirit of "Enlightenment" that erupted in Europe during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Many activists in the modern gay rights movement, however, prefer to trace the beginnings of their movement to June 27, 1969, when a riot broke out in a gay bar in Greenwich Village called the Stonewall Inn. The Stonewall Riots ignited a firestorm in lower Manhattan for nearly a week, but the implications of what happened there continues to this day.

There were other hangouts for homosexuals on Christopher Street in lower Manhattan, but on that summer day the New York Police Department had received a complaint saying that a group of gay men was openly engaging in sodomy and oral copulation in and around the Stonewall Inn. When officers arrived at the bar, they confirmed what they'd been told and immediately started making arrests. Three or four men were handcuffed and hauled off to jail, but suddenly, egged on by a group of drunk and disorderly patrons, bystanders started tossing drinks, glasses, and eventually chairs at the policemen. Backup calls were made to other precincts for reinforcements, and before long a full-scale riot was under way.

Rumors spread quickly, and by the next day news of the "Stonewall Riots" was all over the nation's newspapers. New Yorkers were scandalized by what was happening, but during the sixties it didn't take a lot to turn a small disturbance into a national media event, and over the next five days the police found themselves in pitched battle against not just homosexuals and other free-thinkers in Greenwich Village, but against protestors from all over the East Coast, marching for "homosexual liberation" There's more to this story, of course, and much that preceded and followed these events, but many homosexuals today refer to that week as the birthday of their movement and the beginning of the so-called gay rights campaign.¹⁰

For many on the political left, Stonewall was a great victory. It was a cause to fight for and even to die for. And that attitude has now seeped into

the mainstream culture. In December 1999, during the presidential campaign, Vice President Al Gore promised that if elected he would "eliminate this unacceptable form of discrimination" against homosexuals. Like many in his party, Gore found it was politically expedient to refer to homosexuality as the last frontier of discrimination in America. Unfortunately, that view is in dramatic conflict with both science and psychology, and in response the Traditional Values Coalition launched a massive grassroots campaign in Mr. Gore's home state of Tennessee in the fall of 1999, showing the voters what the candidate had said, as well as the facts about the homosexual lifestyle in our video *Gay Rights, Special Rights*. The voters got the message, and, as history now records, Mr. Gore lost that historic vote because he failed to carry Tennessee.

There have been many victories and defeats in this struggle over the years. As courts, legislatures, and other governing bodies from Massachusetts to California, and even the Supreme Court, have come out strongly in favor of homosexual marriage (and against the sanctity of the traditional two-parent family), the battle to preserve the sanctity of the home seems to be growing hotter than ever. And sometimes even our friends seem to be looking the other way. On October 13, 2004, in the final presidential debate of the 2004 campaign, the question was asked: "Do you believe that homosexuality is a choice?" Senator John Kerry answered simply, "No, it is not a choice" And President Bush, who should have known better, answered, "I don't know."

As for Senator Kerry, we witnessed the same kind of disinformation we've always seen from those on the Left, pretending that homosexuality is natural and an inborn condition. On the other side, however, we saw a refusal to speak the truth because of the potential controversy that might have erupted in the middle of a political campaign. What neither candidate would admit was that there is no evidence to suggest that homosexuality is anything but an emotional disorder.

Never has any research institute, any school of medicine, any journal of medicine, or either of the major therapeutic organizations-the American Psychiatric Association or the American Psychological Association-or even the National Academy of Sciences ever said that medical researchers have found a "homosexual gene." That's because no such gene exists. There is no conclusive science to show any correlation whatsoever. But that hasn't stopped the homosexual community from making false claims.

Researchers Dean Hamer, Simon LeVay, Michael Bailey, and Richard Pillar have all conducted research projects that set out to prove the innate nature of homosexuality. But in peer reviews and laboratory trials, none of these studies have ever been successfully replicated. This means either that the research data were flawed to begin with or the parameters of the experiments were unsatisfactory because the results of those experiments could never be duplicated under controlled laboratory conditions. Unless research of this nature can be approved and confirmed through peer review, and unless those who are competent in genetic studies are able to replicate

the findings of the initial study, then the evidence can't be trusted.

Perhaps the best example of this was the claim of Dr. Simon LeVay, who exhumed forty-one cadavers, of which about half were former homosexuals who had died of AIDS. After the study, LeVay reported that the hypothalamus (which is the part of the brain that regulates metabolic processes related to sexual response) was smaller in the bodies of men who were homosexual than in those who were heterosexual.¹¹ Again, and predictably, the press picked up on this and reported, "Aha, it's genetic!" By LeVay's logic, homosexuals simply don't have the capacity to be attracted to the opposite sex. Therefore, many concluded, homosexuality is normal. But it didn't take long for LeVay's trial balloon to be punctured.

The study was quickly ripped apart by responsible researchers who said that a proper analysis of the hypothalamus would have to be conducted over a much longer span of time. To conduct a postmortem on men at age thirty-five or forty was not enough. There would need to be an analysis of these individuals at age twelve when they entered puberty, as teenagers with the capacity for reproduction, in their midthirties, and so on over a much longer period of time. Also, analysts asked, if the hypothalamus wasn't functioning properly, then why did these individuals have an attraction for any sex? Why were they attracted to their own sex if this organ was defective? So in the end, LeVay's research was repudiated.

The evidence proves that the studies conducted by LeVay, Hamer, and the others were flawed. That story needs to be told, because the mainstream media have continued to cite LeVay's data as fact. The truth is, there is no medical evidence that would allow homosexuals to claim a biological basis for this condition, and those in positions of authority-including the president of the United States and legislators in Washington and all fifty states-need to have the information and the moral courage to say so.

THE IMPACT OF AIDS AND HIV

There was a lot of talk about health care, prescription drug benefits, and government-funded health programs during the 2004 election season. But almost nothing was said about the potential cost to the nation if taxpayers are forced to pay for medical treatment for the diseases associated with homosexuality. This is very much an issue for social reformers on the Left, who are eager to force all Americans to pay for the mistakes of the few. But if taxpayers are forced to foot the bill for the full cost of medical care for everyone who has contracted AIDS, HIV, or the dozens of STDs associated with homosexual practices, the price tag will be crippling to our federal economy.

Most Americans understand that AIDS is a very expensive disease that is found primarily among homosexuals, drug abusers, prostitutes, wives of

promiscuous men, recipients of tainted blood, and certain others. Over half of all people diagnosed with AIDS in the United States, and as high as 56 percent of new HIV infections, are homosexual males.¹² As I indicated earlier, the AIDS disease was first diagnosed as a disease of homosexual men. It was spread by homosexual men, and long-term study confirms that it is increasingly a "gay disease"¹³

More than half of AIDS patients in this country are homosexual males in their twenties and thirties.¹⁴ Treatment of debilitating illnesses of young or middle-aged patients consumes a much larger share of public resources. Unlike elderly patients receiving subsidized care, most of whom have already paid for their treatment by decades of social security deposits, younger beneficiaries of public medical care are drawing on the system at a time they ought to be making their greatest contribution.

A report published in the Los Angeles Times in 1995 examined government documents dealing with the costs of medical care for AIDS and HIV patients and concluded that the impact of socialized care for these individuals would consume approximately 1 percent of the entire Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of the United States.¹⁵

According to another report cited by the Wall Street Journal in February 2004, as high as 3 percent of all men living in New York City already have HIV. In the nation's prisons, HIV is on the average of seventeen times more common than in the general population. For the most part, these are not elderly patients. They are men who, except for their own bad choices, should be active, contributing, and productive members of society. But now their health care is being paid for by the American taxpayer, and this enormous debt just continues to rise.

Politicians and pundits talk about the need for compassion for those who are infected with STDs, genital cancers, and all the other medical maladies that come from homosexual promiscuity, and that's true. We ought to care and help where we can. But there's hardly a word of caution or concern for the actions that produce these illnesses. Instead, the media glorify the gay and lesbian lifestyle by presenting images of happy, clever, carefree homosexuals and defying anyone to point out what's really happening to these men and women.

The media rarely associate the diseases with the behaviors that produced them, and that's a real problem. At least 43 percent of the homosexual men estimate they've had sex with five hundred or more different partners in their lifetime. And 28 percent admit to more than one thousand partners. The result of all this sexual profligacy is that homosexuals now account for at least 80 percent of America's most serious sexually transmitted diseases.¹⁶

Young people who engage in homosexual acts are twenty-three times more likely to contract a sexually transmitted disease than those who are

strictly heterosexual.¹⁷ Male homosexuals are fourteen times more likely to contract syphilis than heterosexuals, and they're thousands of times more likely to develop AIDS.¹⁸ The obvious conclusion has to be that homosexuality is not a lifestyle. It's a deathstyle, but the mainstream media won't say it, the political Left won't say it, and the cost of medical care for those afflicted with these maladies is out of control.

THE HIGH COST OF DENIAL

Medical researchers estimate that there are as many as ninety thousand new AIDS cases in the United States each year. It is estimated that one in every two hundred fifty persons in this country is HIVpositive, with more than ten million cases worldwide. The cumulative cost of treating the HIV-infected population in America now exceeds \$13 billion, and the average yearly cost of treating persons with AIDS is at least \$38,000 per year. The cost of treatment throughout an AIDS patient's life is estimated at over \$130,000.¹⁹

The cost of AIDS treatment to the global economy was estimated to top \$514 billion in the year 2000, and to amount to more than 1.4 percent of the world's gross domestic product. The cost to the United States alone was estimated between \$81 billion and \$107 billion.²⁰

The impact of HIV/AIDS on the economy and the health-care industry is enormous. A report in the mid-nineties estimated that each AIDS patient costs hospitals as much as \$260,000. In some hospitals, according to the National Public Health and Hospital Institute, AIDS patients take up more than 7 percent of the beds. The average hospital stay for AIDS patients is 12 days, compared to 7.2 days for the typical hospital visit. The report further suggested that taxpayers should expect economic losses to increase, due to the fact that 90 percent of HIV-infected patients in public hospitals rely on Medicaid, Medicare, or charity for funds to support their treatment. At the same time, the Journal of the American Medical Association reported that the average cost of intensive care unit treatment and hospitalization for AIDS patients averaged \$174,781 per year of life saved.²¹

AIDS and HIV infections may be the most pernicious health concerns for epidemiologists today, but the spread of sexually transmitted diseases (STDs) is no less dangerous for society. Except for monogamous heterosexual couples who avoid all other forms of sexual conduct, there is no such thing as "safe sex"

A report in the December 15, 2004 issue of the Journal of Infectious Diseases revealed that homosexual men are contracting diseases that were once found only in women. For example, human papillomavirus (HPV), which has been causally linked to cervical cancer in women, was found in 57 percent of the homosexuals who participated in the study, and it is linked to anal cancer in men.²²

The same study reported that HPV infection rates are highest in certain cities. Among participants from San Francisco, 61 percent were infected; from Boston, 57 percent; 60 percent from New York City; and 49 percent from Denver. One of the principal contributing factors leading to HPV infection, researchers said, was the number of different sex partners the participant had during the previous six months.²³

According to researchers Dr. Brandon Bankowski and Susan Bankowski, at least one in four persons will contract an STD at some point in their life. More than twelve million Americans, including more than three million teenagers, are infected with STDs each year. And as many as fifty-six million American adults and adolescents may already have a lifetime incurable STD. They write:

Many STDs occur without symptoms, are more severe in women, and often go undetected until permanent damage has occurred. If left untreated, they can lead to long-term complications, including severe pain, infertility, birth defects, various cancers and other diseases, and even death. Young adults are at greatest risk of acquiring STDs, for reasons that include having many sexual partners, partners who are more likely to have an infection, and lower use of contraceptives. As well, the public and private costs of STDs are immense. Conservative estimates of total costs are around \$10 billion in the United States, rising to \$17 billion if HIV infections are included.²⁴

AIDS, HIV, and STDs are already taking a toll on public welfare, and it's clear that the lives of homosexual men and lesbians are being devastated by illness. But the problem doesn't end there either. A report on suicide in the United States prepared by the National Center for Injury Prevention and Control reveals that more people die from suicide each year than from homicide. In the year 2000, there were 29,350 suicides, which is 1.7 times higher than the homicide rate. Today suicide is the eleventh leading cause of death for all Americans, and the third leading cause of death for people between the ages of fifteen and twenty-four.²⁵

Figures concerning catastrophic illness, suicide, and death among young people are easily the most troubling. And these data are not restricted only to those on the fringes of society. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the American College Health Association estimate that one in five hundred college students is infected with HIV.²⁶ This estimate is based on the results of a blind study conducted at nineteen American universities. A followup study at twenty-four colleges found HIV infection to be about .2 percent, which is consistent with the earlier study.²⁷ If this seems like a high percentage of college-age young adults, consider that the CDC estimates the rise of HIV infection for all Americans of all age groups to be one in two hundred fifty.²⁸ On top of this, there are at least eleven hundred suicides on college campuses in this country each year, which

ought to tell us that the faddish popularity of "sex, drugs, and rock 'n' roll" among young adults today, combined with the celebrity status of homosexuality, is a lethal combination.²⁹

Males are more than four times more likely to die from suicide than females, but females are more likely to attempt suicide than males, and the rate of suicide among homosexual males is highest of all.³⁰ According to one assessment of this crisis from the National Center for Health Statistics, there were at least 4,960 suicides among young people between the ages fifteen and twenty-four in 1993 alone. In fact, these numbers may actually be substantially higher since many suicide³¹ deaths are wrongly categorized as accidents.

In the forty-three years between 1952 and 1995, suicides among adolescents and young adults nearly tripled. And from 1980 to 1997, the rate of suicide among persons aged fifteen to nineteen increased by 11 percent. Among those aged ten to fourteen there was a 109 percent increase, while the increase for black teenagers in the fifteen to nineteen age group was 105 percent. In 1999, more teenagers and young adults died from suicide than from cancer, heart disease, AIDS, birth defects, stroke, and chronic lung disease combined. Anecdotal evidence makes it clear that the main reason for this epidemic of suicide is the feeling of being overwhelmed by life, by the lack of connection with parents and peers, and by the emptiness of their sex-and-drug saturated lives.³²

SHOOTING THE MESSENGER

The worldwide AIDS epidemic is considerably worse than has been reported. International figures distributed by the United Nations suggest that one in every one hundred sexually active adults worldwide is infected with HIV. Of those, however, only about one in ten is aware that he or she is infected with the virus. If estimates of current transmission rates are reliable, there may be as many as forty million diagnosed and undiagnosed cases of AIDS and HIV worldwide. And if you track groups most affected by the outbreak, you begin to see where the problem comes from.

Again, here are the facts: The source for 77 percent of all transmission of AIDS/HIV among whites is homosexual males. Among blacks, 49 percent of AIDS/HIV transmission is from homosexual males, and these high rates are consistent across all racial and ethnic lines.³³ The mainstream media and our cultural elites are working overtime to alert us to the dangers of smoking, alcohol abuse, environmental pollutants, obesity, and even SUVs. All these things, we're told, can reduce our "life expectancy." But, far and away, nothing reduces life expectancy like the homosexual lifestyle.

For untold centuries we've known that there's only one sane and healthy form of sexuality and only one way to avoid contracting sexually transmitted

diseases. And that's to reserve sexual intimacy to the marriage bed and the husband and wife to remain monogamous and faithful to one another forever. But this is not the message the mainstream media and the cultural elites want you to hear. They are too busy promoting an agenda that will destroy the lives of millions.

In 1985, the state of California passed a law that fined medical practitioners as much as \$10,000 and threatened them with a year in jail for violating the confidentiality of patients diagnosed with AIDS or HIV. While this new law may have prevented embarrassment for the individuals concerned, it also meant that physicians and nurses could not alert members of the medical staff of the risks of contagion during surgery. And it meant that employers and even spouses could be denied critical, life-saving information.

TABLE 2: Estimated number and percentage of persons with HIV/AIDS diagnosed, by race/ethnicity, sex, and transmission category—32 states*, 2000–2003³⁴

Transmission category	White, non-Hispanic		Black, non-Hispanic		Hispanic†		Asian/ Pacific Islander		American Indian/ Alaska Native	
	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)
Male										
Men who have sex with other men (MSM)	25,842	(76.6)	19,535	(48.5)	9,047	(60.9)	399	(64.8)	308	(60.9)
Injection-drug use (IDU)	3,264	(9.7)	7,372	(18.3)	2,362	(15.9)	74	(12.0)	76	(15.1)
Both MSM and IDU	2,251	(6.7)	2,018	(5.0)	753	(5.1)	25	(4.0)	55	(11.0)
High-risk heterosexual contact [§]	2,071	(6.1)	10,815	(26.8)	2,527	(17.0)	106	(17.3)	62	(12.2)
Other [¶]	310	(0.9)	537	(1.3)	162	(1.1)	12	(1.9)	4	(0.8)
Total	33,738	(100.0)	40,278	(100.0)	14,851	(100.0)	616	(100.0)	505	(100.0)
Female										
IDU	1,999	(30.4)	4,060	(16.7)	674	(17.8)	21	(11.4)	61	(29.1)
High-risk heterosexual contact [§]	4,390	(67.1)	19,510	(80.4)	2,982	(78.7)	153	(83.6)	146	(69.3)
Other [¶]	166	(2.5)	685	(2.8)	136	(3.6)	9	(5.0)	3	(1.6)
Total**	6,545	(100.0)	24,254	(100.0)	3,792	(100.0)	183	(100.0)	210	(100.0)

* States with confidential, name-based reporting of HIV infection. Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming

† Hispanics might be of any race

§ Sexual contact with someone of the opposite sex known to have HIV/AIDS or at least one of the following HIV risk factors: MSM, IDU, or hemophilia

¶ Mother-to-child exposure, receipt of blood transfusion, blood components, or blood products, receipt of organ or tissue transplant, artificial insemination, or unintentional occupational exposure to human blood or other body fluids

** Totals include one person of unknown sex and also can differ from the apparent sums because of rounding of estimates that resulted from adjustments for reporting delay and missing risk factors.

Like homosexuality itself, the AIDS epidemic has become a massive industry dedicated to denial, subterfuge, and disinformation, aimed at preventing normal Americans from making the perfectly logical connection that homosexuality is the primary cause of AIDS and HIV. Not only does this limit the possibilities of suitable treatment, but it is also an assault on prevention and early diagnosis of conditions that may lead to the diseases. Instead of being treated like the pandemic that it has in fact become, AIDS has been given the status of a "civil right" and a badge of honor among many homosexuals and their supporters.

Many in the homosexual community are in denial about the consequences of their behavior. But ignoring the link between homosexuality and life-

threatening illness is a sure formula for disaster. According to a report by WorldNetDaily on June 2, 2005, doctors in Canada and the United States began reporting a surprising increase in a highly contagious STD that some are calling the "new AIDS" According to a report in the Canadian Medical Association Journal, lymphogranuloma venereum, or LGV, is on the rise among homosexual men, and the CDC is now reporting confirmed cases in San Francisco, Atlanta, and New York City. LGV is a form of chlamydia, and if left untreated, it causes swelling of the genitals and rectum. It can lead to meningitis, encephalitis, and death.³⁵

Even more tragically, doctors are now reporting a surge in the number of cases where young homosexual men have deliberately sought to contract HIV and AIDS in order to be a part of this "heroic campaign." Surely, this phenomenon has to be the expression of a death wish and a psychotic reaction to an epidemic that has grown immeasurably worse because of denial and delusion within the homosexual community.

Is THERE ANY HOPE?

Let me say it again: same-sex attraction is neither inborn nor even permanent. Rather, it's an emotional choice. Psychologists tell us that in many cases something generally traumatic has happened in the life of certain individuals that has created a "gender-identity conflict" This in turn fosters an emotional disorder that can lead to homosexuality. But science and psychology have also shown that even long-term homosexuality can be cured, and the stories I've heard from countless individuals who have "come out" of the gay lifestyle are truly inspiring. I will share some of those in another chapter. Very much like recovery from alcohol and drug dependency, it's never an easy process. But with God, all things are possible.

By exposing the myths that have been passed on by the homosexual community, and by providing strong arguments for holding on to biblical and historical standards, my aim here is not to further brutalize or stigmatize homosexuals. The evidence is so clear that they are already in a life-and-death struggle with their own desires and the physical reality of their condition. But in this book I am determined to marshal arguments and evidence that may help to counter the downward drift of our culture into sexual chaos and anarchy. The figures of death, disease, and dysfunction in this chapter are somber, and on the surface they can also be disheartening. But I truly believe that with God's help, there is hope.

Disease can be controlled or moderated in many cases, and homosexuals can indeed change. I know that God is big enough to stop the advance of homosexual advocacy in our homes and schools. And I'm convinced that, with His help, we can win this struggle. But it will take all the courage and resolve we can muster, and in this regard, I can speak from experience.

Homosexual hit squads have spray-painted my house, and they've shouted my colleagues and me down in many different places. It has happened at public gatherings and at churches. For a long time, in fact, some churches wouldn't invite me to come to speak because they were afraid of the consequences if homosexuals were to attack us. But God has preserved me, and the message continues. The fact is, God wants this word to get out. And when all is said and done, I'm convinced that God will hold us all accountable if we don't have the courage to stand and be counted. You only need to turn on your television to see evidence of the wickedness that's invading our culture and corrupting America's youth. So, whatever the cost, I'll be at my post.

On the other side of the issue, I know from experience that we can win this debate if we will dare to take a stand and speak up when called upon. As just one example, in 1993 the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) announced that they were going to issue a new regulation calling for a "religion-free workplace" This was, of course, shocking to Christians and to many others all across the nation. So I consulted with my staff, and we decided to put out an alert to our friends and supporters. Then I spoke with the leaders of several Christian organizations, and over the next few weeks we got on the phone and talked to thousands of people all over the country. Before long, more than one hundred thousand letters flooded into the EEOC offices in Washington, calling on them to withdraw that odious new regulation.

We then made an appointment at the EEOC headquarters and met with three members of their legal team. As I sat there with Gary Bauer, Beverly LaHaye, Ralph Reed, and representatives from the EEOC, I sensed that the lead counsel for the EEOC was about as lesbian as the pope is Catholic and that I needed to raise the issue of sexual diversity. This was, incidentally, on the heels of the homosexual March on Washington in 1993, which was also Bill Clinton's first year in office. So I said to her at one point, "Have you taken the issue of sexual diversity into consideration, in any way that would have affected this decision?" It was like I had stuck a hot fork in a filling in her mouth! That woman couldn't have jumped further, and she went into utter disequilibrium.

A friend who had been in the room said to me later, "Lou, I thought you were going to have to go over there and do an exorcism on her!" Well, it was hot and heavy that day, but it was definitely worth the effort.

Those one hundred thousand letters made a huge impact, in part because it had required unusual measures for them to process so much citizen response. The EEOC had to rent a warehouse to enter all that data into their computers, and they even had to hire additional staff to record all those names. Consequently, the department went over budget trying to process all that information. And you know that had a huge impact on their ultimate decision. Subsequently I went to see Senator Howell Heflin of Alabama, and he decided to call a special hearing on this matter. That hearing, in turn,

helped to set back the homosexual agenda in the workplace by years.

Within a week of those meetings, one of the commissioners on the EEOC, a woman who was a holdover from the first President Bush, called me and said, "Man, did you blow that lawyer out of the water! As a result of your visit to our offices, we are totally rejecting the religion provisions of that statute. All the business about a 'religion-free workplace' is gone now." So that was just one example of the kinds of victories we've witnessed. It's evidence of the spiritual warfare we're engaged in, and there are many stories like that.

TURNING THE TIDE

If Christians and others who understand the consequences of the gay agenda and who struggle with statistics like the ones I've cited previously will begin to stand their ground, we will see change, and I'm convinced we'll see surprising victories in the months ahead. But that doesn't mean the struggle is over. Sexual hedonism still pervades the airwaves, and the Howard Sterns and Michael Eisners of the world aren't going away without a fight.

I'll have to admit that in some ways, the Tina Turner song I mentioned earlier was correct. The homosexual subculture has nothing to do with love or marriage or a lifetime commitment. As gay men have routinely confessed, monogamy is the last thing they want. What they want is unrestrained sexual license with absolute freedom to do to and with anyone they please whatever they please. But as any sane person should see, this is a formula for absolute disaster, and this is why the public health disaster for homosexuals in this country is out of control.

Blocking advance of this homosexual deathstyle and restoring the moral foundations of our culture ought to be at the forefront of every Christian's concerns. As anthropologist J. D. Unwin made clear in his important work on sexuality and culture, no nation that rejects monogamy in marriage and premarital sexual chastity can last longer than a generation after it has embraced sexual license.³⁶ Therefore, if we don't have change, renewal, and spiritual revival, along with a recommitment to the values that once exalted and ennobled this great nation, then our civilization will only sink deeper and deeper into dissipation, denial, and disaster.

What this means, then, is that spiritual revival is essential for our national survival. What we need is not just legislation, not just activism, and not just change, but an authentic spiritual awakening that is bold enough and broad enough to restore the hope and vigor of our nation.

Yes, we need a constitutional amendment to fully protect marriage. We need laws in Congress, the state legislatures, and all our local municipalities that uphold the importance of the intact two-parent family. But we must

also have a renewed commitment to what is morally right and socially responsible if we want to see a turnaround in this prognosis of defeat.

Homosexuality grows out of social disorder in the family, complicated by various other factors. This is not my discovery but the determination of countless psychologists and scholars. In general, homosexuality is rarely a factor where you have fathers training their sons to be responsible citizens and productive members of society. When mothers teach their daughters to be morally straight, when community organizations cooperate to support and defend the family, and when the messages coming from the media and other forces in the mainstream culture begin to celebrate and applaud morally responsible behavior, our children will have a healthy view of their sexuality and their role in society.

But before I give the impression that all the problems are on the other side, or that they're the problem of the secular culture, let me be quick to say that the church, and particularly its leaders, has a lot of explaining to do as well. Because many have tried to avoid this issue, or have tried to avoid using biblical phrases and Scripture to point out what's at stake here, we have in a sense become unwilling coconspirators in this tragic loss of virtue. And now our own loss of moral judgment is staring us in the face, to such an extent that we not only smell the smoke at three o'clock in the morning, but also we suddenly see the flames racing down the hall.

Sometimes I feel as if the church has become codependent on the corrupt culture, on the order of an alcoholic who wants to break the habit but can't let go of his familiar habits. Somehow we have to awaken the prophetic spirit and the immense power of the church to engage the culture in a more dynamic way. We need to regather our strength and our moral courage in order to help bring about a new moral formation and to bring a halt to the threats to our homes, families, and this nation. The church has to be the church once again. For too long the church has surrendered its moral authority, but there's an awakening taking place. Christians are reclaiming our mandate from God to become what Christ commanded the church to be. The successes of "values voters" has helped, but there's a lot more to do.

BACK TO BASICS

For years we heard people say, "Never mix politics and religion! Church and state must remain totally separate:" But that philosophy simply won't work, and our Founding Father George Washington expressed the reason why that's true as well as it's ever been done. He said: "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports" They are, he said, "the great pillars of human happiness;" and they are absolutely indispensable if our society is to function the way it was designed.

The separation of church and state is a lie. But the really good news is that today, more than ever, Catholics, Protestants, Jews, and many others are joining hands in this fight to help restore the foundations of our civilization. The loss of moral authority over the last forty years hurt us a lot, but we should be quick to celebrate the fact that there's a new movement rising in our midst like a phoenix out of the ashes. It's a movement that is biblical, sanctified, and deeply committed to rebuilding the walls-like Nehemiah in the Old Testament-of what our forefathers called "the New Jerusalem"

When I was a boy in Washington DC, we never had a Christian Booksellers Association Convention. We didn't have the National Religious Broadcasters. But today we have both these tremendous organizations, which are being mobilized to change the culture. What we have is a re-creation, a clarification, and a reformation of where we stand. What I see so often these days is sophisticated Pentecostals, evangelical Protestants, and life-affirming Roman Catholics who are beginning to find common ground. That's what we're beginning to see around these social issues, and I couldn't be happier about that.

At the Traditional Values Coalition we say that there are five moral issues that have been taken from us by the secular culture, and these are the ones we must now recapture. That's part of the battle that surfaced during the 2004 presidential election when people motivated by values showed up in record numbers. Let me list them because I think the fact that Christians and other moral conservatives agree on these is a monumental step forward. The five are:

1. The right to life-including the sanctity of life, euthanasia, stem cell research, and so on
2. Pornography and obscenity, and how to limit their impact on families
3. Supporting the family and the rights of parents to direct the destiny of their children (including all aspects of education and the home school movement)
4. Religious liberty-keeping the state off the back of the church
5. The homosexual agenda-the defense of marriage and defending against the indoctrination of our children in the schools and colleges

These are our issues. They're biblical issues, and we will define and defend them. They're the gold standard and the silver standard, and they're matters that ought to be central to the hopes and prayers of every believer. The price of potatoes or pork bellies or other things on the commodities market, those aren't our issues. But the Word of God and the moral and cultural issues that come forth from it, those are our issues. The sanctity of life and the prosperity of the family are our concern.

In 1977, the talented singer and actress Anita Bryant was invited to Virginia Beach by Pat Robertson after she had helped to defeat a major homosexual initiative in Florida. I was on the platform that day when she spoke, and the first time she used the word homosexuals, the homosexual activists stood up and started shouting and causing a disturbance. That was the first time I'd ever seen that sort of thing in a public place. That was their tactic then, and it still is. Because the homosexual community cannot deal with truth, and because they can't argue with the statistics in this chapter in any sort of rational manner, they try to intimidate those who disagree with their agenda.

Those are Brown Shirt tactics. They're not new. Hitler used them to diabolical effect, and they are still being used today. But there's a new spirit in the air. With God's help, we will get the word out, and we will win this debate. We will stand our ground because when homosexuals lie, people die, and this is one battle that God's people simply must win.

BEYOND LAW AND ORDER

The only foundation of a free Constitution, is pure Virtue, and if this cannot be inspired into our People, in a Greater Measure, than we have it now, They may change their Rulers, and the forms of Government, but they will not obtain a lasting Liberty. We have no Government armed with power capable of contending with human passions unbridled by morality and religion.... Our constitution was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other.

-JOHN ADAMS OCTOBER 11, 1798

IN CUPERTINO, CALIFORNIA, a fifth-grade teacher was forbidden to teach vital documents of American history, as the school's principal explained, because it would be a violation of the separation of church and state. Patricia Vidmar, principal of Stevens Creek Elementary School, demanded that Stephen Williams submit all his lesson plans and supplemental materials for her review, and she stipulated further that any document that mentioned God or the Bible could not be used. Among items censored by the school were the Declaration of Independence, the diaries of George Washington and John Adams, writings of William Penn, and constitutions of the thirteen colonies.¹

No, this is not a scene from Brave New World. It actually happened in November 2004, and with the full support of the independent school district of that city. But now that intense media scrutiny has been focused on this case, is there any chance the principal's decisions will be upheld? In a statement to the media, Mr. Williams' lawyer from the Alliance Defense Fund, Gary McCaleb, said: "The district is simply attempting to cleanse all references to the Christian religion from our nation's history, and they are singling out Mr. Williams for discriminatory treatment. Their actions are unacceptable under both California and federal law"²

But what is the law? And what sort of defense do we need to uphold traditional Christian values and beliefs? Incidents involving the suppression of religious speech, and many of them much worse than this one, happen every day. Indeed, most of them go unreported. But in light of all the anti-Christian rulings of the last thirty years, including especially the issues discussed in these pages, we have to wonder if law and order still exist in

this country.

Judges, lawyers, and liberal activists have been playing fast and loose with law and order for years now. The idea of a "separation of church and law" that was hatched by the Supreme Court in its 1947 Everson decision has been a battering ram for shoving Christianity out of the public square.³ Since that time, every sort of perversion has crept into the public schools, and the slightest mention of Jesus Christ or the Bible can lead to litigation and outright persecution of Christians.

In some places people are being prosecuted for hate crimes that often amount to little more than name-calling. In Canada and Western Europe these laws are becoming truly sinister. Recently the campaign to destroy religious freedom got a huge boost in Canada from a statute pushed through the Canadian parliament by homosexual activists. This legislation, known as Bill C-250, adds "sexual orientation" to Canada's hate crime laws. The day the bill passed, a homosexual activist named Mark Hanlon, at Memorial University in the Canadian province of Newfoundland, sent an e-mail to pro-family groups that said:

These right-winged conservatives are teaching these same messages to their children for the good of society and for the good of morals and ethics. Let's get this one thing straight to all you Conservative groups-your children's attitudes, if they inherit these beliefs from you, will be in a minority down the road. You are setting them on a dangerous path of intolerance and hate. Stop this path-before the world of tomorrow judges them, and thanks to this bill, prisons [sic] or fines them. Crimes of hate against the LBGT community will be treated equally with anti-Semitism, and anti-African Canadian hate crimes.⁴

Rest assured, if homosexual activists have their way in the United States, we will see the same sorts of intimidation, along with an increasing mobilization against Christianity and moral values by those on the Left. The same people who scream "tolerance" and "diversity" are the first ones to persecute Christians and others who resist the gay agenda and the legalization of homosexual marriage.

There have been some signs of backlash in Canada and a few other places, efforts to stop threats and harassment of this kind. But if you think for a minute that the same type of fascist mind control can't happen here in the United States, then you haven't been paying attention.

SUPREME INJUSTICE

There may be no better evidence of the homosexual agenda and the war being waged on moral judgment than the victory handed to homosexuals

and their supporters by the Supreme Court in the case of *Lawrence v. Texas* (2003). In that contentious ruling, the Supreme Court overturned its own prior decision in *Bowers v. Hardwick* (1986), which held that state laws that outlawed sodomy were constitutional. In *Bowers*, the Court held that such laws were statebased and therefore not federal issues. But by the time the esteemed justices came to the *Lawrence* case twenty years later, things had changed. The agenda had done its work, and the Court struck down not just a Texas law that prohibited homosexual sodomy, but also similar laws in thirteen states.

The case, followed closely by the homosexual community, was a huge win for the gay agenda. Groups such as the Human Rights Campaign, the National Lesbian and Gay Task Force, and the Gay & Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation celebrated wildly, sending talking heads to every media outlet. The Court never comments on its rulings and wouldn't do so in that case. But when presented with an appeal shortly thereafter to block a ruling by the Massachusetts Supreme Court that allowed homosexual marriage, the Supreme Court of the United States refused to hear the case, effectively declaring that homosexual marriages would be allowed to proceed.

As a consequence of the legislative and judicial activism in Massachusetts, not only would homosexual weddings be allowed to proceed in that state, but also the "full faith and credit" clause of the Constitution could be invoked to sanction "civil unions" and "same-sex marriages" that had been enacted by the Vermont legislature in 1999 and by the mayors of San Francisco and New Paltz, New York, in February and March of 2004, among others.

What happened between 1986 and 2003 to change the Court's view of sodomy? According to one reporter for a prominent homosexual publication, "The justices have spent an unprecedented amount of time with out gay men and lesbians and have even faced speculation about the sexual orientation of one of their own, David Souter"⁵

But whether or not any member of the present Court may be homosexual, or merely supportive of the homosexual agenda, there are homosexuals on the staff of the Supreme Court. Consequently, the shift in thinking among these justices is not merely ideological but also practical—a matter shaped to some degree by the day-to-day realities of their working environment.

Not everyone on the Court, however, was so blind to what was actually happening in the *Lawrence* decision. Justice Antonin Scalia penned a powerful dissent in the *Lawrence* case that made more than clear what was behind the Court's misguided ruling. In it, Justice Scalia said, "Today's opinion is the product of a Court, which is the product of a law-profession culture, that has largely signed on to the so-called homosexual agenda, by which I mean the agenda promoted by some homosexual activists directed at eliminating the moral opprobrium that has traditionally attached to

homosexual conduct."⁶

The Supreme Court was less than objective in this case, he said, and with the concurrence of justice Clarence Thomas, Justice Scalia was letting the Court and the nation know that their lack of honesty and objectivity were not being overlooked by the American people. In his extensive remarks, the associate justice went on to say that:

It is clear from this that the Court has taken sides in the culture war, departing from its role of assuring, as neutral observer, that the democratic rules of engagement are observed. Many Americans do not want persons who openly engage in homosexual conduct as partners in their business, as scoutmasters for their children, as teachers in their children's schools, or as boarders in their home. They view this as protecting themselves and their families from a lifestyle that they believe to be immoral and destructive.⁷

The Supreme Court views any effort by citizens to resist homosexual indoctrination as discrimination, Scalia added, which is something the members of the Court apparently believe they're empowered to stamp out. Then Justice Scalia said:

So imbued is the Court with the law profession's anti-antihomosexual culture, that it is seemingly unaware that the attitudes of that culture are not obviously "mainstream"; that in most States what the Court calls "discrimination" against those who engage in homosexual acts is perfectly legal.⁸

There was little doubt that the mainstream media and those on the political Left would bristle at these words, but this man of conscience was not backing down. He made it clear that he wasn't merely being narrow and judgmental in his view. But, rather, he said:

Let me be clear that I have nothing against homosexuals, or any other group, promoting their agenda through normal democratic means. Social perceptions of sexual and other morality change over time, and every group has the right to persuade its fellow citizens that its view of such matters is the best. That homosexuals have achieved some success in that enterprise is attested to by the fact that Texas is one of the few remaining States that criminalize private, consensual homosexual acts.⁹

Using the power of persuasion is one thing, he said, but for the Supreme Court to impose its liberal bias on the nation, and to create policies by judicial fiat that would never be approved by the voters, is not justice but totalitarianism. Then Scalia went on to say that, "What Texas has chosen to do is well within the range of traditional democratic action, and its hand

should not be stayed through the invention of a brand-new 'constitutional right' by a Court that is impatient of democratic change."¹⁰

The travesty wasn't just that a 143-year-old Texas statute had been struck down by the Court, but the abuse of power that came with it and the attitude of a six-justice majority that felt their own personal ideology could trump constitutional law and "the will of the people." After all, as Justice Scalia concluded, "it is the premise of our system that those judgments are to be made by the people, and not imposed by a governing caste that knows best."¹¹

TAKING SIDES WITH THE ENEMY

In state after state, and now even in the U.S. Supreme Court, we are seeing how the homosexual lobby and their legions have managed to convince the justice system to do their bidding. Using tactics they learned from Hitler's manifesto, *Mein Kampf*, and other forms of coercion and intimidation more appropriate to the Soviet gulags, the homosexual hit squads aren't simply responding to mere provocation. They're not defending themselves; they are on the attack against every sign of resistance to their battle plan for the conquest of moral judgment.

As if the *Lawrence* decision weren't bad enough by itself, the Court's misjudgment has opened the doors to other bad laws in other jurisdictions. In February 2005, a federal judge in Pennsylvania was so moved by the *Lawrence* decision that he declared federal obscenity laws to be unconstitutional. In one of the most outrageous cases I've ever seen, Judge Gary Lancaster declared that "public morality is not a legitimate state interest sufficient to justify infringing on adult, private, consensual, sexual conduct, even if that conduct is deemed offensive to the general public's sense of morality."¹²

According to Lancaster's warped sense of justice, the Constitution guarantees a "right to sexual privacy, which encompasses a right to possess and view sexually explicit material in the privacy of one's own home" Specifically, he was referring to the case against a group of pornographers called Extreme Associates that films women being beaten, raped, tortured, and even murdered. In their own advertising, the individuals who run this despicable operation claim to explore "the depths of human depravity." But Judge Lancaster saw no wrong and found the pornographers innocent of any crime. But we saw this coming. This is where bad law like the *Lawrence* decision is bound to lead.

Another example of a situation where law enforcement got it all wrong was the case of the eleven Christians who were arrested on October 10, 2004, at an "Outfest" gay pride event in Philadelphia. When homosexual activists spotted this small group of Christians, merely praying, singing, and

reading Scripture on a city sidewalk, they sounded the alarm and called on a gang of homosexual vigilantes known as "The Pink Angels," who did everything imaginable to obstruct, impede, and prevent the Christians from speaking freely in a public forum.¹³

The homosexuals cursed and threatened the Christians, and then held up large sheets of cardboard to keep passers-by from reading the signs the protesters were holding. But these belligerent homosexuals weren't stopped or even warned by the police. Instead, Philadelphia's finest hand-cuffed and arrested all eleven members of the Christian group, Repent America, from seventeen to seventy-two years of age, and hauled them off to jail. Eventually five of them, including the group's founder Michael Marcavage, along with Mark Diener, James Cruse, Dennis Green, and a seventeen-year-old teenager, were ordered to stand trial.

Labeled the "Philadelphia Five" by the media, these were simply Christians dedicated to peaceful resistance to public displays of perversion. By singing, praying, and sharing the gospel with any who would listen, they were trying to provide an alternative point of view. But the homosexuals were having none of that, and charges filed against the Christians included criminal conspiracy, ethnic intimidation, and incitement to riot, all felonies, plus five other misdemeanor charges.

If convicted, they were told, these Bible-believing Christians would have faced up to forty-seven years in prison and fines as high as \$90,000. As the news of this outrage was broadcast around the country, I'm sure many people had to be asking themselves: What's the world coming to when honest Christians can be threatened with forty-seven years in jail for speaking against sin, while a crowd of angry homosexuals are given the red carpet treatment?

Philadelphia Municipal Court Judge William Austin Meehan reportedly charged the Christians after viewing a videotape of the incident. You have to wonder what he was seeing. But what disturbed me most of all was the report that attorneys for the United States Department of Justice (DOJ) were present at the scene and had apparently advised police officers to arrest only the Christians. Later, a confidential source at the DOJ told WorldNetDaily, a popular Internet news site, what had happened.¹⁴

LEAPING INTO THE FRAY

As soon as I learned of the government involvement, I immediately contacted the Department of Justice (DOJ) in Washington to find out what was going on. I was shocked that federal attorneys were advising Philadelphia police to arrest innocent Christians who were, in fact, being threatened and harassed by a gay mob. Shortly thereafter we also learned that the Outfest organizers had planned in advance to confront and attack

any Christian protesters they encountered.

As chairman of the Traditional Values Coalition, I asked for an investigation into the matter, and if it turned out that DOJ lawyers were actually involved, then appropriate action would have to be taken. At the very least, the federal government would be implicated in a civil rights violation and could be sued in federal court. Eventually a judge of the Philadelphia County Court of Common Pleas dropped the charges, while implicitly accusing the Christians of using KKK and Nazi tactics.

But the senior attorney for the American Family Association's Center for Law and Policy, Brian Fahling, wasn't letting this fiasco fade silently away. Instead, he filed charges in federal court on behalf of the Philadelphia 11 and called for a Department of justice investigation of the corruption and abuse of power by officers of the court in "the city of brotherly love."¹⁵

This is just one more example of how far the homosexual lobby will go to silence its critics. But make no mistake: society cannot survive if law enforcement turns a blind eye to hostility and intimidation toward the Christian majority by homosexuals, and then excuses those guilty of targeting citizens who have a First Amendment right to speak their mind in a public forum. And more importantly, we can't even call ourselves a constitutional republic when justice Department lawyers are suddenly taking sides against moral values and standing with sexual deviants.

Unfortunately, this sort of behavior is all too common today, as one expert witness pointed out at a congressional hearing a few years ago. When Robert Knight, then on the staff of the Family Research Council, testified before a U.S. Senate committee in 1999, he made it clear that Christians and other moral conservatives are being targeted by homosexuals. As in the Philadelphia case, the homosexual antagonists are almost always excused while the Christians are prosecuted under hate crimes laws.

In that testimony, Knight pointed out that these new politically correct hate laws are not enforced equally. He cited the example of Pastor Ralph Ovadal, founder of Wisconsin Christians United, in Madison, Wisconsin, who was physically attacked in 1996 while protesting a pro-homosexuality photo display at a public school. Pastor Ovadal and a friend held up signs that said simply, "Homosexuality Is Wrong" and "Homosexuals: Repent or Perish"

But suddenly an angry gay man in the crowd grabbed one of the signs and ran away. When Pastor Ovadal confronted him, the man turned and punched Ovadal and knocked him to the ground. A medical report filed later indicated that the assault had caused "abrasions, contusions, and an injured ankle" However, here again, police took the other side in the dispute. The angry homosexual wasn't charged with a "hate crime;" even though the city of Madison has a strong hate crimes law in place. Instead, the belligerent attacker was able to bargain for a misdemeanor charge that was about as stiff as a traffic ticket.

In another case in 1991, Dr. Charles McIlhenny's home was firebombed by homosexuals who were "offended" by his stand against the homosexual agenda in that community. When his church was attacked, he had called the city's hate crimes unit and was told that "the Christians have their point of view, and the homosexuals have theirs" So they "cancel each other out;" and no charges could be filed. This is what happens to "law and order" when homosexuals rule.

Despite the destruction of property, physical assault on a pastor and his parishioners, and the disruption of a worship service-a clear violation of California state law-the police in that case refused to help, and I will have more to say about that shortly. But as Robert Knight testified before the U.S. Senate, "Apparently, some hate crime victims are more important than others" And that's why "hate crimes" laws are always a bad idea.

UNSAVORY TACTICS

For students and teachers at a church school in Ohio, their opposition to homosexuality took a sinister turn when a homosexual activist called them with a bomb threat. In that incident, the pastor of St. Paul Lutheran Church and School in Westlake, Ohio, took the call from an individual who demanded that the pastor go on local TV and announce that he had changed his position on homosexual marriage. If the demand wasn't satisfied in one hour, the caller said, he would set off an explosive device hidden in the building. School principal Jim Krupski said later that the caller was angry about the Lutheran Church Missouri Synod's stance on homosexuality. "That's as much as we know," he told reporters, "and we leave it in the hands of God to hopefully turn this person's heart so that they repent of what they've done..."¹⁶

Westlake police were called, and they quickly evacuated all 280 students and the staff from the building, but found no bomb. But St. Paul's Church wasn't the only Christian group targeted by homosexuals in that city. A few weeks earlier, a janitor at another church in Westlake had been beaten by a group of homosexuals in retaliation for the pastor's recent sermon on the sin of homosexuality. Troubling? Yes. Uncommon? No, and less so every year. But this is what may be happening everywhere if current trends continue. Homo-fascism is a reality now in Canada, and it's only a matter of time until the assault on Christianity and moral values invades every city and town-unless, by God's mercy, justice is somehow restored.

For thousands of years we've known the consequences of sin, and the Bible offers a safe and secure guide for maintaining a healthy and vibrant society. But how much have things really changed over the centuries? King David put the question long ago: "If the foundations are destroyed, what can the righteous do?" (Ps. 11:3, NKJV).

Today we're still trying to answer that question and deal with the consequences of our choices. In the preceding verse, the psalmist says, "The wicked bend their bow; they make ready their arrow on the string, that they may shoot secretly at the upright in heart" (v. 2, NKJv). The technology has changed since David's day, but there's no question that evil men still prey on the righteous. Only today they have advocates in some of the highest offices in the land.

It's common knowledge that hate crimes laws punish religious freedom and attempt to control private thoughts and beliefs, yet in May 2003 Senator Ted Kennedy reintroduced what he calls the Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act (S. 966), to try once again to create a federal hate crimes initiative. As you would imagine, this is a high priority for homosexual activists. Kennedy attempted to pass virtually the same legislation in 1997, 1999, 2001, and then in 2003. The latest version included the term "gender," which is a code word for crossdressers, transvestites, and transsexuals. Kennedy insists that the bill is needed because of an epidemic of hate crimes against minorities and homosexuals. When he reintroduced the bill in 2003, he said, "Hate crimes based on sexual orientation continue to be a serious danger, constituting 14 percent of all hate crimes reported" But those statistics are misleading.

A study by the Republican Policy Committee of the Senate, published in the months following Kennedy's proposal, reported that this bill would seriously undermine local law enforcement efforts. With Kennedy's bill, every crime labeled as a "hate crime" would be federalized, meaning that federal prosecutors would be in a position to prosecute local cases. The study said that:

In practice, every interracial crime with minority victims will automatically have to be considered a possible "hate crime"-as will every crime where the victim is a homosexual, a transsexual, a transvestite, disabled, or a known member of a religion; such consideration will even extend to most crimes in which the victim is a woman. The bill would encourage police to treat victims differently depending on whether they fit into a special status created by Congress.¹⁷

Kennedy's bill set out to criminalize the beliefs of millions of Americans who are critical of homosexuality, and it included any criticism of deviant sexual behaviors in the same category with racism, misogyny, and anti-Semitism. The closing statement of the Republican report put these matters in proper perspective. In it, Senator Jon Kyl writes that:

The moral and religious objections that many millions of Americans have toward homosexual, transsexual, and transvestite behavior ought not be compared to the marginalized and hateful viewpoints of a few on issues of race. But if Congress truly seeks

such an extension of the civil rights laws to reach homosexuals, transvestites, and transsexuals, it should do so through appropriate legislation that provides for the full airing of that debate. By including these groups in hate crime legislation, advocates seek a "stealth" addition to the legislatively defined "protected classes" of the civil rights laws.¹⁸

Kennedy's bill actually said that moral disapproval is "inappropriate and unacceptable" It further condemned the beliefs of Christians, Jews, and Muslims who hold strong reservations about homosexuality and compared them to Nazis and members of the Ku Klux Klan. What Jon Kyl's group wanted to do, however, was illustrate the hypocrisy and absurdity of those charges.

No 'HATE CRIMES' EPIDEMIC

The FBI's 160-page report that summarizes hate crimes reported by law enforcement agencies around the nation says there were a total of 8,715 offenses, 9,100 victims, and 6,934 offenders involved in hate crimes incidents in 2003. Of those, 51.4 percent were racially motivated; 17.9 percent were due to religious bias; just 16.6 percent were attributed to sexual orientation; and 13.7 percent involved the ethnicity or national origin of the victim. In addition, 0.4 percent of the cases involved persons with a physical or mental disability.¹⁹

None of these crimes are acceptable, of course. Attacking anyone because of his race, religion, nationality, or personal appearance is offensive and ought to be punished. But let's take a closer look. For example, how do these numbers compare to overall crime rate in this country? According to FBI and DOJ statistics, there were 16,500 murders in the United States in calendar 2003, which comes to almost six murders for every 100,000 U.S. residents. In addition, there were 413,402 robberies that year, which is a rate of 142.2 robberies per 100,000 residents.²⁰

An earlier FBI report reveals that of the 18,097 murders committed in calendar 1997, 13 of them were listed as hate crimes. The victims were all men, and the perpetrators were all men. Exactly 3 of the victims in those cases were homosexuals. Of 16,914 murder victims in 1998, FBI records show that 4 could be considered hate crimes directed at homosexuals. Of the 1,317 crimes reported as hate crimes against homosexuals in 1999, all of them involved simple assault, physical intimidation, or name-calling. And of a total of 11.6 million crimes reported to the FBI in 2000, only 1,517 involved sexual orientation. This is slightly more than one onethousandth of 1 percent. Hardly an "epidemic." ²¹

What ought to concern us is not an array of insults labeled as hate crimes, but situations when there are actual infractions of the law, such as arson,

assault and battery, burglary, drug offenses, gang violence, murder, rape, vandalism, and things of that nature. All of these crimes are already on the books. They don't have to be invented. Furthermore, they're crimes that civilized societies have always punished. And they don't single out certain privileged groups for special rights. They are there to protect all citizens, as the law is intended to do.

The prophet Jeremiah got it right: "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?" (Jer. 17:9). But the laws of a just and virtuous nation are meant to punish wrongful behaviors, not to police what a person may be thinking at the time of a violent act. It's God's job to judge the heart; the law can only judge actions and behaviors, and that's a concept the Founding Fathers surely understood.

When they penned the Bill of Rights included in the United States Constitution, the Founding Fathers meant to protect American citizens from unwarranted assaults by law enforcement on the privacy of citizens. The Fourth Amendment says:

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

Likewise, the First Amendment, which was specifically written by James Madison and Thomas Jefferson to protect individual liberties, holds that:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

This is what liberty is all about. All citizens have the right to speak their mind in the public forum, so long as they do not incite violence or physically harm another person in the process. The free exercise of religion, if nothing else, certainly means that we possess the right to read Scripture, sing hymns, and proclaim the gospel without fear of intimidation by goons or government agents. Neither Congress nor any law enforcement agency can change that fact: so says the Constitution. But as we're discovering, some who hold high and mighty offices prefer to ignore or to misinterpret these words.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AMONG HOMOSEXUALS

If public officials really want to stem hate and violence against homosexuals, they might start by reading the book entitled *Men Who Beat the Men Who Love Them*, by David Island and Patrick Letellier. These authors, who are editors of a National Lesbian & Gay Domestic Violence Network newsletter, report that there may be as many as 650,000 incidents of domestic violence among same-sex partners each year. "The probability of violence occurring in a gay couple," they write, "is mathematically double the probability of that in a heterosexual couple..."²² In the light of media scrutiny following that widely publicized comment, the authors backtracked slightly on their estimate. But by any measure, the amount of violence in homosexual households far exceeds that of heterosexual couples.

Another study published in the law review of Valparaiso University reported that from 50,000 to 100,000 lesbians and as many as 500,000 homosexual men are battered each year in this country.²³ And a separate report published in 1998 by the American Bar Association estimated that domestic violence among gay and lesbians is a major concern for between 25 to 33 percent of all cohabiting same-sex couples.²⁴

So where is the hate? Clearly, the problem is not primarily in traditional homes or among heterosexual couples. But thanks to intense pressures from the homosexual community, police and law enforcement are looking for ways to punish those who resist the homosexual agenda. If they succeed, it will only be a matter of time until hate crimes laws are used against pastors and others who preach against homosexuality from the pulpit. Pastor Kristopher Okwedy, of Port Richmond, New York, offers a case in point. In 2000, he put up two billboards with quotes from Leviticus about homosexuality. He was forced to remove the quotes a few days later because they violated that city's pro-homosexual antidiscrimination ordinance.

In Madison, Wisconsin, Christian firefighter Ron Greet lost his job for distributing a pamphlet entitled "The Truth about Homosexuality" to his colleagues at the firehouse. My dear friend—who is a gifted speaker, a former congressional candidate, and an outspoken leader of the black community in that city—was eventually suspended and ordered to attend diversity training for violating Madison's antidiscrimination code. On campuses all over the country, students are forced to attend "sensitivity training" to enforce acceptance of homosexuality, and many large corporations now insist that employees maintain a homosexual-friendly culture.

These are just a few examples of how hate crimes laws have been used to silence those who have legitimate objections to homosexuality on biblical grounds, and there are many others. The homosexual lobby's efforts to create a new category of crime are actually an effort to punish individuals who stray from the politically correct orthodoxy. Employers and employees will lose freedom of speech and religion if those, like Senator Kennedy cited above, have their way. Typically, hate crimes laws have prohibitions against "intimidating" or "coercing" an individual. Depending on who is doing the

accusation, this could be as simple as quoting Scripture to a co-worker or leaving a tract on someone's desk.

An article in the Wall Street Journal described the tyranny of hate crimes laws. Like all restrictions on free speech, the writers said, any ban on "racist" or "homophobic" speech would rest on a slippery slope. Most Christian denominations believe that homosexuality is a sin. So are these people to be silenced by law because their view is unacceptable to gays? Maybe we aren't there yet, they write, but when people can be given additional time in jail for what they were thinking while committing a crime, we're fast approaching "rule by a thought police" A good many people, the journal reporters suggested, including some who support hate crimes legislation, might find that "a hateful outcome"²⁵

Political scientist Ronald J. Pestritto, who teaches at St. Vincent College in Pennsylvania and serves as an adjunct fellow with the Claremont Institute observed recently that hate crimes legislation is actually a political fad that "seeks to criminalize all feelings, thoughts, or attitudes that run contrary to the trends of the day."

In his article "The Ideology of Hate Crimes;" Professor Pestritto said that hate crimes laws must first assume that "there are more serious crimes out there than murder, or the taking of human life."²⁶ And advocates of hate crimes laws must believe that "crimes motivated by animus toward homosexuals must be considered the most hateful of all. Thus, we see that anti-homosexual murder is considered worse than other kinds of murder, yet beating another human being unconscious with a brick and dancing with glee about it-as Los Angeles rioters did live on television a few years ago-is hardly considered a crime at all since it was motivated by rage over the racist Rodney King trial verdict."²⁷

In their book Hate Crimes: Criminal Law & Identity Politics, James B. Jacobs and Kimberly Potter write that hate crimes laws are aimed at criminalizing personal opinions and beliefs. The term "hate crime;" they say, isn't about hate at all, but what a person believes about right and wrong. "By linking hate speech prohibitions to generic criminal law," they write, "many well-meaning advocacy groups and politicians seek to shake a fist at the kind of ideas, opinions, and degenerate personalities that 'right-thinking' people abhor.

"But;" they add, "we must consider whether punishing crimes motivated by politically unpopular beliefs more severely than crimes motivated by other factors itself violates our First Amendment traditions"²⁸ Yes, that should be at the top of the list. Why should someone who kills a homosexual receive a harsher sentence than someone who beats a woman to death while stealing her purse? It's reasonable to assume that both killers were motivated by violence and hatred. At the very least, neither killer showed respect for their victim, which is an issue with most hate crimes

laws.

Frankly, I'm hard pressed to understand what such high-minded lawmakers are thinking. There's no loving way to beat someone to death. Yet hate crime advocates would gladly add a more severe penalty to certain convictions because of what the criminal may have been thinking when he or she committed a crime.

A PRICE TO PAY

There's no epidemic of hate crime in America, and such laws are merely an attempt to criminalize a person's thoughts. In addition, they violate free speech and create a permanent "victim class" that receives special rights not afforded to other citizens. Hate crimes generally include "hate speech" as well, or actions that might be perceived by some people as hateful. The law should not be used as a weapon to protect deviant practices that millions of Americans oppose. And that's why we ought to resist them.

Is there a price to pay for standing up for our beliefs and resisting those who are trying to stamp out our values? Yes, there is. But the price is not too high if we truly understand what's at stake. Over the last thirty years I've been verbally and physically attacked at least twenty-seven times because of my stand on the homosexual agenda. It has happened on airplanes, in airports, on the street, in hotels and churches, at my office, and even at my home, where homosexual "storm troopers" have invaded our workplace screaming profanities and threatening us with physical harm. They storm-trooped my home in California, and the police had to come out to both the office and the house to stop these assaults. In addition, I have been burned in effigy two times, once in San Francisco and once in Sacramento, California.

To make my point, let me describe in the next few pages the "live and let live" tactics that homosexuals have used with me. These are just some of the times when I've been attacked for daring to stand up against the gay agenda. The first was in the spring of 1988. I was at the hall of administration in Santa Ana, the county seat of Orange County, California. Jeff LeTourneau was the leader of the ACT UP group in that area, and they literally attacked me when I arrived. I had come to testify against a policy ordinance concerning domestic partnership benefits, and the homosexuals thought they could silence me. They didn't.

Then there was the time when a large group of muscular homosexuals came to our offices in Anaheim and tried to dump horse manure all over our office. Two of them tried to break into our office. The cops came but did not arrest them. My son, Stephen, who was a student at Western School of Law, tackled two of them when they came into our suite, forcing them back out of the office. Meanwhile, the police did absolutely nothing.

On another evening when I was appearing on television in San Diego, word went out to the homosexuals that I was there, so they went to my home and tried to storm-troop it while I was away. Fortunately, a friend nearby saw what was happening and called the police. Then at the last minute the station in San Diego decided there was too much commotion to have me at the station, so they arranged for me to do my part of the broadcast from a remote location. It's a good thing they found another location to tape the interview because, sure enough, another group of homosexuals showed up at the station to try and shut them down.

On another occasion I was in Redding, in Northern California, at the North Valley Baptist Church, when they attempted to disturb the worship service. But fortunately the sheriff of Shasta County, who attends that church, was in the sanctuary at the time, and he wasn't about to put up with that nonsense. He immediately had them all removed. Later I was at the Echoes of Faith Church in Ontario, California, when another mob attempted to disturb the service. And again at Power Community Church, where California Assemblyman Gil Ferguson was speaking for the coalition. They tried to shut down those meetings, but to no avail.

A CONTEST OF WILLS

When we held a conference on Reparative Therapy, we rented a hotel in Anaheim for a two-day seminar at which Dr. Joseph Nicolosi, who is head of the National Association for Research and Therapy of Homosexuality (NARTH), was to speak, along with Congressman Bill Dannemeyer and Dr. Jeffrey Satinover. Several hundred guests were signed up to attend the event, but a large gang of homosexuals appeared suddenly and tried to take over the podium. We were able to block that attempt. However, during the night they managed to set off stink bombs in the conference rooms that soon filled the entire hotel with foul and acrid fumes that were carried up through the entire building by the ventilation system. That was the first time they actually succeeded in disrupting our event, but it was also a graphic example for our conferees that, I'm sure, only stiffened their resolve.

Sometime later, in 1989, we announced a seminar on how the church ought to respond to threats from homosexuals, and a group of storm troopers came to the hotel ahead of our meeting and blocked the entrance to the hotel. The police came and literally moved them out. Then on Labor Day weekend 1990, homosexuals showed up at my home in Anaheim on a Saturday. A group from Los Angeles and surrounding counties encircled the cul-de-sac where we live. The neighbors saw it and came to our rescue by calling the police and doing a number of other things. Then, about a year later, in October 1991, the homosexual gangs storm-trooped our office in Sacramento.

Gov. Pete Wilson had just come into office, and he had vetoed the gay

rights bill that homosexuals pushed through the Assembly. The Traditional Values Coalition had raised a tremendous level of awareness on the issue. So as soon as the news was broadcast that the bill had failed, our offices were storm-trooped by hoodlums. The police were called, and they had to take us out using the fire escape of that old building. We went down a rickety old ladder from the fifth floor, which was challenging, but we made it just fine.

A year later in the fall of 1992, our house was spray-painted with all sorts of vulgar and hate-filled words by homosexuals. Then, a few days after the homosexual March on Washington in April 1993, my wife and I had plans to leave on Tuesday morning to head home. We chose that day because we thought everyone would be cleared out by then, but we were wrong. As we were waiting in line to get our boarding passes, I heard these wild catcalls behind me, and I knew who it was. It was a group of homosexuals who had stayed over. We ignored it, got our boarding passes, and went down to the gate. That's when I realized that these people were going to be on the same plane, first to Chicago, and then to John Wayne Airport in Orange County.

We boarded the flight, and Beverly and I were seated in the bulkhead row. We settled in, and the plane took off. As I was reading the morning paper, a homosexual came up to me and slashed the paper in half with his fist. He stuck his finger in my chest and said, "I'm dying of AIDS, and you're going to die, too"

I took that as a personal threat, so I took off my seat belt and immediately walked up to the first class section and spoke to a flight attendant. I said, "My life has been threatened," and she just laughed at me. She didn't know what I was talking about, but another flight attendant who knew who I was intervened. She had seen me on John McLaughlin's Sunday morning television program on which I had debated Congressman Barney Frank-and, quite frankly, I had run circles around him.

That flight attendant immediately went to see the captain. He came out of the cockpit, put on his cap and jacket, straightened his tie, and walked back to the coach section of the plane. They were stamping their feet in rhythm, yelling, "Shame, shame!" Well, one thing you don't do is stamp your feet on an airplane at thirty thousand feet, so the captain got on the loudspeaker and said, "In case some of you may not know it, I am the law up here, and my instructions to passengers and crew members on this aircraft are the law. If those of you who are creating a disturbance don't stop what you're doing immediately, I will land this plane in Pittsburgh and have every last one of you arrested by the police officers at the gate" Some of them acted as if they weren't going to stop, but others convinced them to quit while they were ahead.

At that point the captain moved us up to first class-it was the first time I'd ever flown first class-and when we got to Chicago, it turned out he had called ahead and notified the authorities. So when we landed, an American Airlines security officer met the plane, along with a Chicago police officer,

several plainclothes policemen, and airport security. They escorted Beverly and me off the plane, but no sooner had we left the Jetway than another homosexual began taunting us. Then, very quickly, one of the officers opened his coat and put his hand on his gun and said, "If you don't leave these folks alone, you're going to be flat on your back!"

That shocked the homosexual, and he immediately started yelling, "First Amendment," and all those things. Airport personnel took us back to a holding area, and we waited there until things calmed down. When we boarded the plane for Orange County, they put us in first class again, and everything went smoothly until we landed. But as we were pulling up to the terminal in California, I noticed that our plane was moving very slowly. And when we turned onto the tarmac, I looked out the window and noticed several sheriff's vehicles on the runway. At that point the captain came on the loudspeaker and said, "I want everyone to remain in your seats with your seatbelts fastened. This aircraft is under restriction"

When they opened the door, police officers came on board and said they wanted to take Beverly and me off first. So I asked one of them, "Officer, why are you doing this?" And he said, "Your friends in the back of the plane have been on the phone, and there are three hundred homosexuals out there ready to eat you alive" So they took us down the stairwell and put Beverly in one vehicle and me in another and took us to a secure area. I must say, that was one of the most harried times we've had. But it wouldn't be the last.

HOMO-FASCIST TACTICS

Sometime later there was an encounter at the Oakland Airport when I went there to speak. Some homosexuals were in front of me on a Southwest Airlines flight. It was very early on a Sunday morning, and I was on my way to speak at the 10:00 a.m. service at a large black church. This group of homosexuals did the same thing the earlier group had done on the Southwest flight: they called ahead using the in-flight phones, and when I arrived, there was a whole bunch of homosexuals waiting for me. I just walked right past them. They were yelling and screaming, and the other people in the terminal weren't sure whom they were screaming at. But they were walking five or six feet behind me, and they kept it up until we got to the baggage claim. At that point a policeman told them to either stop it or go outside, and that's where it ended.

On another occasion in Santa Ana, California, the homosexuals wanted to have a parade on Father's Day. So we went to the Santa Ana City Council with people from forty or fifty of the local churches, and we were able to stop it. But when the meeting was over, the homosexuals confronted us in the hallway with several hundred of their supporters. They created quite a ruckus and had us pinned against the walls. The meeting eventually had to be dismissed; it was a terrible experience, but no one was hurt.

Then it was Labor Day weekend in the park in Santa Ana. Since we had convinced the city council to stop their parade, the homosexual storm troopers decided to come after us. We took the same group of pastors and church leaders who had gone with us to city hall and held a rally at the other end of the park. We stayed on our end of the park, but the homosexuals came to our end and, once again, began yelling and screaming and creating a ruckus.

The police protected us very well. The next day, which was a Sunday, the gays had a parade in the park, and a group of what I'd call "radical Christians" (a group we did not by any means support) showed up with shopping bags full of soiled baby diapers. They confronted the homosexuals and began throwing dirty diapers into their cars. As you can imagine, a riot soon broke out.

We did not support those tactics, and we do not believe in doing anything that humiliates or injures another person, no matter how much we may disagree with their words or actions. But when the local newspaper ran a story about the confrontation, I had to laugh. The reporter said, "Rev. Sheldon was nowhere to be found," as if I'd orchestrated the counter-protest and then skipped out. The reason Rev. Sheldon was nowhere to be found was because I was in Modesto speaking at another event.

I didn't want any part of what took place that day, and I don't support those tactics. But that doesn't mean the other side doesn't resort to such disgusting tactics. As an example, on one occasion we were having a ministers' seminar on the homosexual agenda in Sacramento, and fifty or sixty homosexual activists came in through the service entrance of the Hyatt Hotel and took over that meeting, as they had done on other occasions. Unfortunately, the hotel was afraid to arrest them in those days, so that meeting was shut down too.

These are examples of the homo-fascist tactics that homosexual activists have learned from Adolf Hitler: when you have no valid arguments, and when you can't persuade by reason alone, then take over and intimidate by violence. The events of that day illustrated in graphic terms how belligerent and dangerous these homosexual hit squads have become, and our supporters weren't the only ones watching. More and more, the public is recognizing what the homosexual agenda is all about. We've seen these tactics before, and we all know where they lead. And in time, I believe, their own behavior will condemn them.

A TIME TO REMEMBER

Perhaps the most shocking and widely publicized attack took place in September 1993, when I was speaking at the Hamilton Square Baptist Church in San Francisco. During the evening service, a large group of

homosexuals gathered outside the church and attempted to stop people from entering. As usual, attendance on Sunday night at that church was very good, and the Christians just pushed their way through the crowd and came on in.

I had been invited to speak that night. When my wife and I entered the church, there were fifteen to twenty militant homosexuals on the sidewalk outside waving signs and chanting. As we were talking with the pastor, Dr. David Innes, before the service began, we observed that the crowd had grown larger, to nearly one hundred. At that point, the thugs outside began destroying church property, breaking the cement benches in the church courtyard, and ruining the flower gardens. They hauled down the American and Christian flags and raised the homosexual multicolored flag in their place. And when we looked out the window, we could see church members being accosted as they arrived. In several cases, their Bibles were yanked from their hands, and the front doors were body-blocked by large numbers of angry homosexuals. We had to rescue many people by pulling them through that human blockade, among them our friends Pastor Charles McIlhenny and his wife.

The police were called, and we asked them to stop the destruction of church property and to put an end to the harassment of church members. But with a very sad and broken spirit, we were told by these officers that they were not allowed to interfere in the homosexuals' demonstration against us-by orders of the San Francisco government. Recently, they said, a policeman had been put on administrative leave for stopping homosexuals from committing public sex acts, even though there were laws against that in the city. The sergeant told me, "If I stop these people, the Board of Supervisors will put me on leave"

We continued to hear the chanting as we began the service that evening, and after praise and worship I was introduced and came up to the pulpit to speak. At that point, another group of homosexuals went around to the other side of the sanctuary where there were large double doors, and they began pounding loudly on the doors. It sounded as if they were using battering rams to break down the doors. All this was recorded on the tape of the evening service.

I realized at that point that if those doors were broken down, there was only one object of their wrath, and that was me. So I stepped down from the pulpit, found a telephone, and called 911. When the dispatcher answered, I was told that they had already sent four or five policemen to the church. To which I said, "Ma'am, you'd better send the riot squad, or the blood may flow all the way down to city hall!" At that, they finally did send the riot squad, and those officers were successful in removing the homosexuals and pushing them back to the sidewalks. Unfortunately, they did not stop them from yelling profanities and chanting threats at us.

They continued haranguing us with the most vulgar words they could

think of, which is also against a California ordinance that says protesters may not come within five hundred feet of a church to disturb a worship service in that manner. (In fact, this is legislation that I had prevented the legislature from repealing several years earlier.) Somehow we managed to finish the service, at which point the police dismissed our people in three groups and escorted each of them out by different ways to their cars. Beverly and I were the last to leave.

The homosexuals were still there, but the police had put up their plastic shields and created a walkway for us to pass through, and they helped us into a waiting van. There were police posted on the rooftops around the church, and a police helicopter hovering overhead to make sure that things didn't get completely out of control. They drove us to the Oakland Airport, and we flew out later that night. But that was just the beginning of what would soon become a media sensation.

Fortunately, the recording system in the church was running the whole time, and all those sounds and conversations had been captured in real time. When he realized what was on that tape, Dr. Innes sent a copy of the service to Dr. James Dobson, who played it on his national radio program Focus on the Family, which reaches more than six million listeners on fifteen hundred stations coast to coast, five days a week. On the morning that tape was broadcast, I got a call from my daughter, Andrea Lafferty, telling me that she woke up to the sound of that pounding on the church doors in San Francisco. Her radio alarm was set to go off when the Dobson program came on, and when she heard my name, she told me later, she was surprised and frightened. I assured Andrea that I was OK, but it had been a frightening experience for all of us. If there was any question that we were engaged in spiritual warfare, this was the proof.

Six weeks later when Dr. Innes called for a religious liberty rally at Hamilton Square Church, about four hundred fifty ministers from all across the country showed up. I came for the service, which was held on a weekday, and afterward we all walked down to city hall together. We wanted to address the city council, but this time we weren't taking any chances. A dear friend from the Oakland Christian Center was able to bring with him all the men from his rehabilitation program, most of whom were in treatment for drug or alcohol addiction, and I can tell you those guys were physically fit!

When we left the church, they created a wall around us, and we walked the seven blocks to city hall. No one touched us on the way. The homosexuals weren't at the church that day, but they showed up at city hall and blocked the front doors. But suddenly those strong men who had come with us just lifted me up by the elbows and bounded up the stairs two at a time, right to the front door. When they saw us coming, believe me, the homosexuals turned on their heels and ran.

Later, the local homosexual newspaper said we had cast an evil spell on

the people at the door, and I had to laugh. The prophet Isaiah says, "Woe to those who call evil good, and good evil" (Isa. 5:20, NKJV), and that's just what they were doing. To them, our efforts to do good could only be seen as evil. But we knew God was at work that day, and He still is.

When we got inside the building, we went up to the second floor where the board of supervisors holds their meetings, and the homosexuals had already taken most of the seats. After I had testified about what happened that day, I walked back to my seat and thought, The roof must be leaking. But when I looked around, there was this huge homosexual man-he must have weighed 350 pounds-who had brought a cup full of water with him, and he was spitting at me.

The instant they saw what was happening, the bodyguards who came with us grabbed that big man and flipped him flat on his back. Then they called for police assistance. The room was already lined with police officers who had seen what happened, so they grabbed the big homosexual and arrested him. The headline in the San Francisco paper the next day was, "Homosexuals Clash With Christians, and Lose" That was quite an article!

The lesson here is that once you decide you're going to come against evil, you have to be sure you have the depth of commitment to stay with it. So many people I've known over the years have started in this battle and quit. It can really get hot in the kitchen when you're fighting for something this important, so you have to have the moral courage to stand your ground. You must be convinced beyond the shadow of a doubt that you are coming against evil and that it must be stopped.

Civilized societies are those that uphold law and order, that have high standards of personal and religious liberty, and that establish a moral framework allowing families to survive and prosper. Until recently, that would have been a fitting description of American society and the American form of justice, but as antireligious bigotry and politically correct ideologies have begun to spread through many places in our culture, we find ourselves at risk as never before, and often at war with those who hate our values.

The only way to win that war is to stand our ground and stand up for what we believe. We ought to rely on law and order to support and defend us wherever possible, but in the final analysis our best hope is to place our trust in the One who alone is beyond law and order.

CHANGES IN THE WORKPLACE

The homosexual rights movement is like a runaway train racing down a mountain pass.... If you listen closely, you can hear the train approaching.... More quietly, the homosexual cultural revolution has invaded our workplaces as one company after another adapts to the changing culture.... Because the policies of Fortune 500 companies invariably "trickle down" to smaller businesses, the societal effect of changes in the workplace can be dramatic.

-JAY ALAN SEKULOW AMERICAN CENTER
FOR LAW AND JUSTICE

AN AMENDMENT TO the Illinois Human Rights Act, which deals with "antidiscrimination protection on the basis of sexual orientation;" was pushed through the state legislature in January 2005 by the state chapter of the American Civil Liberties Union. The measure, signed into law by the recently elected Illinois governor, Rod Blagojevich, makes no exception for churches or other organizations that subscribe to traditional biblical teaching about sodomy, adultery, incest, homosexuality, and other kinds of sexual sin. The language of the statute, in fact, makes it clear that the bill's authors fully intended for there to be no limits and no exceptions in the application of the new law.

The amendment had been stalled in the general assembly for years until it became the centerpiece of a major push by the ACLU in 2004. According to their annual report, the director of the ACLU's Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgendered Rights Project, John Knight, worked with ACLU legislative director Mary Dixon to promote the idea to the legislature. Thanks to their pressure tactics, the bill passed the assembly with the votes of 98 of the 115 House Democrats, 11 House Republicans, 1 House Independent, and 3 Senate Republicans.¹

Predictably, however, passage of the bill created immediate controversy among church leaders and others concerned about the impact this legislation would have on traditional family values. The Illinois Family Institute, a nonprofit group affiliated with Focus on the Family, was joined by representatives from the Family Research Council and the Alliance Defense Fund in making their strong opposition to the governor's actions

known.

The measure, they pointed out, adds sexual orientation to a state law that prohibits discrimination based on such things as race, religion, and national origin. Citizens already have equal opportunity guarantees for housing and jobs, but the governor was unfazed by arguments from the opposition. In his statement to the media, Blagojevich said that, "What we're doing today is older than Scripture: Love thy neighbor. It's what Jesus said when he gave his Sermon on the Mount: `Do unto others what you would have others do unto you.'"²

To date, Illinois is the fifteenth state to prohibit discrimination based on sexual orientation. But the director of the Illinois Family Institute, Peter LaBarbera, cited the words of the principal sponsor of the legislation, State Senator Carol Ronen of Chicago, who insisted the law be applied universally, meaning that churches and religious organizations would not be allowed to reject homosexual or lesbian job applicants on the basis of their sexual orientation. "If that is their goal, to discriminate against gay people," Ronen said, "this law wouldn't allow them to do that. But I don't believe that's what the Catholic Church wants or stands for."³

Apparently, as LaBarbera suggests, the Illinois legislature and Gov. Blagojevich must believe that "gay rights are more important than religious freedoms." They have certainly shown no respect for the values of the majority of Illinois citizens who are religious. There's reason to hope that the bill, passed on the last day of a lame-duck session after an all-out blitz by the ACLU and the state's most vocal homosexual lobby, Equality Illinois, may be overturned by the courts. But that may also be wishful thinking, considering that the direction of the courts in that state (as elsewhere) has been mostly in the opposite direction for some time.

UNREASONABLE DEMANDS

Fewer than 2 percent of the population of the United States is actively homosexual, yet no other group exerts such enormous pressure or wields such power over the nation's cultural institutions. Homosexuals know this. That has been their stated goal since the 1970s, and they want to use that power to coerce the federal government, state legislatures, and the courts at all levels into passing and prosecuting laws that give special rights to same-sex couples and others in the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender community. While they preach tolerance, they are all for laws that punish those who oppose the homosexual agenda.

As we saw in the last chapter, a critical front in the homosexual assault on moral judgment is the effort to pass hate crimes legislation, which includes antidiscrimination laws that grant protected status to homosexuals and give them legal and moral equivalence with racial and ethnic minorities. This is a

fraud. Nevertheless, for years homosexual advocates in Congress have been trying to ram a bill through the Senate-the Employment Non-Discrimination Act (ENDA) -that would not only make "sexual orientation" a federally protected civil right but would also punish any person in a workplace environment who interferes with a homosexual man or lesbian on the job. Such laws could also force churches to hire homosexual applicants and punish employees who share their faith at the workplace.

The problems with such laws are too numerous to mention, but so far this one has never survived a floor vote in either house, and for good reason. Despite warnings from all segments of the population, a Senate committee did pass the bill for consideration by the full Senate, but that's as far as it went. Fortunately, wiser heads prevailed. As my friend Connie Mackey, vice president for government affairs at the Family Research Council, pointed out at the time, "ENDA will require Americans to hire people they believe to be committing immoral acts, precisely because they commit those acts."⁴ And that's not only unreasonable but absurd.

But absurdity has never stopped the Left from trying to push bad bills or to come back time and time again to the same old issues hoping that the constituency may change or that social concerns may have shifted. Like the hate crimes legislation that Senator Ted Kennedy has tried unsuccessfully to force through the Senate since 1997, the Employment Non-Discrimination Act was reintroduced in the House of Representatives in October 2003, with sponsorship of Congressmen Chris Shays of Connecticut and Barney Frank of Massachusetts.

With only minor changes in the wording, the revised bill attempts to legislate special rights for homosexuals, transgenders, cross-dressers, and others. In doing so, the bill returns to the same faulty premise of its predecessors, that sexual orientation is innate and unchangeable. And it attempts to give unnatural sexual behaviors a stature equivalent to that already granted by law to legitimate minorities.

A survey conducted within the homosexual community revealed that, as far back as the mid-1990s, the annual income of homosexual households was as much as 41 percent higher than the national average. In addition, nearly half of all homosexual households included individuals employed in a professional-level or managerial job. Business Week magazine reported further that homosexuals are five times more likely than the average American to earn salaries higher than \$100,000 a year. So where exactly is the workplace discrimination?⁵

A survey by the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) in 1996 found that 43 percent of companies currently offering domestic partner benefits offer those benefits to both opposite-sex and samesex couples. They found that just 26 percent provide health benefits only for opposite-sex couples, and another 21 percent offer benefits only to same-sex couples. All

of which says that the battle for nondiscrimination measures is almost entirely cosmetic, an attempt to keep homosexual issues in the media and in the mind of the public. Why? To grind down resistance and to inculcate the notion that homosexuality is a protected behavior that must be acknowledged and accepted by all people.

MAINSTREAMING HOMOSEXUALITY

There's no question that the attempt to push ENDA and similar legislation through the Congress is a clever political strategy. No one wants to be accused of bigotry or discrimination. But the tactics used by homosexuals to try and enforce widespread acceptance of their lifestyle are misleading and deceptive. In an insightful discussion of this issue in *Touchstone* magazine, Mark Tooley, a research associate with the Institute on Religion and Democracy, points out that ENDA and similar legislative initiatives really have little to do with any legitimate concerns about workplace discrimination. Rather, he says, they're part of a massive public relations campaign to change the way we think. Tooley writes:

Outside of the military and the Church, where do homosexuals typically face workplace barriers? Market surveys show that homosexuals, on average, have higher incomes than the average household. The real objective of "equal rights" legislation for homosexuals is to overthrow our society's few remaining barriers to full acceptance of homosexual behavior and other non-traditional sexual practices.⁶

No civilized society has ever considered the manner in which people engage in sex to be a "lifestyle" True, human sexuality involves powerful emotions and sensibilities, and the sexual choices we make can have serious and long-term consequences. But as Mark Tooley points out, "History shows that full sexual liberation, shorn of all taboos, leads not to freedom but anarchy." And he pointedly adds, "A national policy that treats sexual practice as no different from ethnic identity would emasculate traditional moral restraints regarding sexuality."⁷ ENDA in this light is less a measure for protecting homosexuals than a pretext for persecuting and punishing those who resist homosexual indoctrination.

Using the law to force Americans to accept homosexual behavior may be the goal of the homosexual lobby, but no amount of pressure can force people to change their thinking in such a radical way. And no amount of legislation will ever give homosexuality the status of a "right" with the full magnitude of our First Amendment rights. Freedom of religion, free speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of assembly are all rights woven into the national fabric. They are part of the emotional apparatus of every American.

The Founding Fathers made it clear that those "rights" are granted by God

Himself, and they may not be reinvented, redefined, or undermined by any person or movement, no matter how determined or how well financed they may be. John Kennedy paraphrased this idea very well in his inaugural address when he said that "the rights of man come not from the generosity of the state, but from the hand of God." That's what most Americans believe.

Gay rights activists, however, have been pushing to get sexual orientation added to civil rights laws for at least three decades. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 made discrimination on the basis of race, religion, sex, and national origin a federal offense. Since that time, homosexual activists have tried to force state and federal lawmakers to amend the list by adding "sexual orientation" as a protected category. So far they've failed at every outing, which is not to say that the pressure will not continue or that the political climate may not change. But anyone not driven by an agenda can see the differences, and that's why perceptive legislators continue to resist.

An effort to legislate homosexuality as a civil right protected by nondiscrimination laws was presented to the New York City Council in 1972. The measure was voted down, but had it passed, it would have been the first time any city had created such a right. As it turned out, the first city to pass a nondiscrimination policy for homosexuals was East Lansing, Michigan, later that same year. San Francisco was the second city to pass such a bill, and the effort to extend civil rights protections on the basis of sexual orientation was first introduced in Congress by Representative Bella Abzug of New York. That bill, introduced as the Gay and Lesbian Civil Rights Bill in 1974, was wisely rejected by Congress, but there has been a steady stream of similar proposals ever since.⁸

AN INSIDE EXAMINATION

When reporters for World magazine interviewed spokesmen of most of the twenty-eight Fortune 500 companies that had been identified by the homosexual lobbying group the Human Rights Campaign as having established benefits for domestic partners, they were surprised at how common such policies had become.⁹ What they discovered was that most of them had only adopted the policies in the previous two or three years, which was an indication of growing pressure and the momentum behind the domestic-partner bandwagon.

Two-thirds of the companies with programs already in place were located in California and New York, where there's a large concentration of high-tech, media, and entertainment firms. About half of those interviewed provided domestic-partner benefits to both same-sex and opposite-sex partners. All but one of the rest offered the benefits to same-sex couples only.

Companies typically based eligibility on a signed affidavit that included

terms such as "committed relationship," "common residency," and "financial interdependence" Because such terms could apply equally to an employee and a parent, brother, or sister, some stipulated that the partner must be in a "spouse-like relationship;" or that they could not be closely related to the employee. World's editors noted that while this language may have limited the company's financial liability, it made it hard for them to deny that they were, in fact, promoting sexual sin.

Two of the firms surveyed by the writers tried to sidestep that issue. Principal Financial Group, based in Des Moines, Iowa, referred to their domestic-partner policy as a "non-traditional adult dependent" policy because it included elderly parents and other dependents living in the same household. Xerox simply gave their employees money to purchase health insurance for household members not generally eligible for coverage under their plan.

Despite the claims of homosexual activists that gays and lesbians make up 10 percent of the population, and despite their insisting that large numbers of workers were clamoring for domestic-partner benefits, virtually all the human resources personnel interviewed by World's reporters said that no more than 1 percent of the workforce actually signed up for those benefits. Speaking of the homosexual employee group GALAXE, Xerox's Brent Laymon said, "Their primary motive seems to be recognition rather than a need for medical benefits"

According to the Society for Human Resource Management, the three primary reasons given for not offering domestic-partner benefits were:

1. No interest from employees, 56 percent
2. Concern that health-care costs would increase, 30 percent
3. Moral objections, 21 percent

Most spokesmen downplayed any hint of controversy associated with the company's decision to implement domestic-partner benefits. Joe Fuentes, of the Adolph Coors Company, said, "We had maybe six to ten calls from protesting employees" And he added that a Topeka, Kansas, minister showed up for a one-day picket with about six others and then left. Walt Disney's spokesman refused to talk about boycotts by Southern Baptists and the American Family Association. And after asking reporters about World's editorial policies and readership, the Disney executive quickly ended the interview.

Many respondents, the reporters noted, seemed to be reading from the same talking points when explaining why their companies instituted domestic-partner policies. The response used by the representative for St. Paul Companies was typical: "This policy is consistent with our management's corporate diversity objectives which are to foster an

environment that sustains a committed adaptable work force wherein everyone contributes to their fullest" Words like "inclusion;" "diversity;" "fairness;" and "nondiscrimination" were used, along with the claim that the policy was needed in order for the company to remain competitive.¹⁰

DIABOLICAL PERSISTENCE

Thanks to the constant trumpeting of homosexual activism by the mainstream media, there's not much in such stories that is truly surprising. But perhaps the most revealing finding of these interviews, as World's editors reported, was the four-step process by which each of these companies had been persuaded to embrace policies that would have been unthinkable only a few years earlier.

First, advocates within the company would put together a core group of homosexual and gay-friendly employees with the aim of gaining official recognition from management for their group. It's worth pointing out that a similar approach had been used by civil rights activists in the seventies and eighties. World's reporters found that groups such as the Human Rights Campaign made themselves available to provide tactical training for scores of these mobilization groups, which also helps to explain the similarities in their approach.

Second, the groups would petition management to include sexual orientation in corporate nondiscrimination policies. Once that goal had been achieved, it was deemed unreasonable for management to resist granting domestic-partner benefits because of moral concerns. If managers were slow to comply, the homosexual employees would say that it was a matter of "fairness" How successful were they? According to figures from the Human Rights Campaign, more than half of all Fortune 500 companies have adopted sexual orientation nondiscrimination policies, along with 165 cities and counties, 67 of the 100 largest law firms, and 64 United States senators-including 23 Republicans.

The third step in the employees' plan was for the special-interest groups to begin conditioning fellow employees through sensitivity training sessions. If the environment in the workplace was not already gay-friendly, these groups would try other tactics, such as linking homosexual issues to those of women and racial minorities in the workplace. By adding sexual orientation and nondiscrimination language to the corporate policy, it was then a simple matter of insisting on company-sponsored events such as "diversity training" or "sensitivity training;" which would be mandatory, of course, for all employees.

The last step, then, was to implement domestic-partner policies step-by-step. Frequently implementation occurred in increments beginning with minor non-health benefits. The benefits director at Pacific Gas and Electric

told World that his company only extended domestic-partner benefits to those requesting bereavement leave. But, as it happened, they were considering adding a broader range of benefits.

Careful, methodical, and stressing always the issue of "fairness;" the deed was accomplished. On company time, homosexual workers had to rely on the power of persuasion to accomplish their goals. But it doesn't have to be that way. In fact, if the Human Rights Campaign and other lobbying groups have their way, nondiscrimination policies based on sexual orientation will be the law of the land. ENDA, which would do just that, came within a single vote of passing the Republican Senate in 1996. And it has been brought back in both houses of Congress every eighteen months since that time, and you can be sure that, one way or the other, it will come back again. And you might want to know how your representatives will vote.

If the law is modified to grant homosexuals the status of a protected victim group, you can be certain that companies without domesticpartner policies will find themselves in the minority, and many will become targets of threats and intimidation by the homosexual lobby. Not long ago, homosexual activists claimed that what goes on behind closed doors between consenting adults was nobody's business. Today, as World magazine's editors and writers discovered, sexual behavior is becoming everybody's business.¹¹

No TOLERANCE FOR DIVERSITY

What you must understand is that the effort to legislate special rights for homosexuals and lesbians has nothing to do with protecting homosexuals in the workplace. Homosexuals are already protected by law, just like everyone else. The push for special rights legislation is, in reality, nothing more than an effort to legitimize and respectabilize (to use Gershon Legman's word) the homosexual lifestyle. But doing that would change the nature of both civil rights and natural rights, placing homosexuals into a class of their own, which is why we must resist any attempt by government to pass legislation of this type. Rewarding people with rights on the basis of unnatural sexual practices would make a mockery of law and justice.

Wherever governments, corporations, or municipalities have enacted measures that grant special rights to homosexuals, those who hold to traditional moral values and Christian beliefs have been subjected to discrimination, physical and emotional abuse, fines, sensitivity training, and in some cases even imprisonment. Make no mistake, civil rights for homosexuals is a one-way street: freedom for me but not for thee. And when homosexuality is promoted by society, Christians and other moral conservatives will no longer be able to express their beliefs in public. If that day ever comes, no American will be safe, at home or in the workplace.

The story of Richard Peterson, an employee of Hewlett-Packard who worked in the company's facility in Boise, Idaho, offers an interesting perspective on these issues.¹² During his twenty-one-year career with HP, Peterson, like other employees, was occasionally required to attend classes on providing a gay-friendly work environment. He was expected to read notices on the company bulletin board about homosexual events and conferences and to be sensitive to homosexuals and the way they were treated in the workplace.

Peterson, a conservative Christian, resented those things, as he had every right to do. He believed they were a violation of his conscience, his free speech, and his values, so he resisted the indoctrination and eventually decided to find out just how "open-minded" HP's diversity policies really were—he posted some of his own signs inside his office cubicle. The messages were large enough for passersby to read and featured pictures of various HP employees with captions such as "Black," "Blonde," "Old," "Gay," or "Hispanic;" along with the company's own slogan, "Diversity Is Our Strength" In addition, he posted two large signs with Bible verses about the sin of homosexuality on the bins above his desk. Needless to say, some people at HP were less than tolerant of Rich Peterson's freedom of speech.

One of the Bible verses he had posted on his wall was Leviticus 20:13: "If a man also lie with mankind, as he lieth with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination; they shall surely be put to death; their blood shall be put upon them" When confronted by human resources personnel about the signs, Peterson reminded them of their own policies regarding freedom of speech and religion, and he said that it was his religious duty "to expose evil when confronted with sin" If HP was serious about workplace diversity, he said, then he ought to be free to express his views without fear of censorship.

The managers set up a counseling session in which they advised Peterson that his posters violated the company's policy barring "comments or conduct relating to a person's race, gender, religion, disability, age, sexual orientation, or ethnic background that fail to respect the dignity and feeling of the individual" But Peterson refused to take down the signs, so the company fired him. At that point, Peterson filed a lawsuit, claiming religious discrimination, but he lost his case in the first round. At that point he pursued the case to the next level, to the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals in San Francisco.

When the appeals court ruling was handed down in January 2004, Judge Stephen Reinhardt—whose name surfaced recently when he and two other 9th Circuit judges ruled the Pledge of Allegiance to be unconstitutional—agreed with the decision of the Idaho court in denying Peterson's claim of religious discrimination under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Peterson conceded that the messages he had posted in his cubicle were intended to embarrass and shame Hewlett-Packard's homosexual employees.

The aim, he said, was to encourage them to admit their sin, to repent, and to come to Christ. Judge Reinhardt said that violated company policy, and he ruled accordingly.

Reinhardt noted that Peterson's employers had not objected to a letter to the editor Peterson had written to the Idaho Statesman, in which he called the diversity campaign a "platform to promote the homosexual agenda" Nor did they attempt to prevent him from parking in the company lot, even though his car bore a sticker that said, "Sodomy Is Not a Family Value" But Reinhardt said the company had a right to fire Peterson because he had created "a hostile and intolerant work environment" and because he was insubordinate to his superiors.¹³

Boise lawyer Chris Troupis, who argued Peterson's case on appeal, admitted that the court's ruling came as no surprise. But he said, "The court was extremely hostile to our position on freedom of expression in the workplace" And he added further, "They were either saying that the words used in the Bible alone are offensive and hurtful and therefore prohibited, or that his thoughts were offensive and hurtful, and therefore prohibited. They're either the thought police or they're prohibiting any religious expression whatsoever in the workplace."¹⁴

And maybe that's really the point. In today's multicultural workplace, the one thing you cannot do is to express strong Christian beliefs or resist the indoctrination of employees on the basis of your religious faith. As numerous reports in periodicals such as the Wall Street Journal, Business Week, Forbes, and others have revealed, the effort to indoctrinate employees with attitudes and beliefs that are supportive of "homosexual rights" is now a fact of corporate life.¹⁵ And insisting on traditional values and biblical beliefs is less and less a protected right.

The rapid pace of implementing changes in the workplace was set back in the mid-nineties when corporations such as IBM, Microsoft, Apple Computers, Hewlett-Packard, Eastman Kodak, Xerox, the New York Times, Time Warner, the Walt Disney companies, and others bought into the whole range of gay-friendly policies for their employees. Today there's almost no sanctuary for those who resist these policies. Thousands of firms are now following guidelines designed by homosexuals and mandated by state and local laws to enforce "tolerance" and "diversity" for gays while restricting the free expression of religious and moral beliefs.

TRAMPLING RELIGIOUS RIGHTS

As an example of just how imperious these laws can be, the Illinois House of Representatives passed a bill in January 2005 banning discrimination against homosexuals and transgender people in the workplace. In announcing the new statute, Governor Rod Blagojevich said, "The legislation sends a clear

message that we will not allow our citizens to be discriminated against."¹⁶ Homosexual advocacy groups immediately praised the governor and the legislature for the bill's passage, while opponents said the new law would trample on the freedoms of other people-especially people of faith who oppose homosexuality and "gender confusion"

Peter LaBarbera, executive director of the Illinois Family Institute, pointed out that the new legislation actually amounted to a green light for promoting the homosexual agenda in Illinois. The bill's religious exemption is "so big," he told reporters, "you could drive a semi through it." Furthermore, he said, the bill "sets a dangerous precedent by creating civil rights based on homosexual and transgender behavior."¹⁷

By adding sexual orientation to that state's existing nondiscrimination laws, LaBarbera said, the new bill would lead inevitably to more legal action against churches and groups such as the Boy Scouts that oppose homosexuality.

Very soon the law would require that the state create special legal protections for cross-dressers and transsexuals, since the definition of "sexual orientation" included in the bill also guarantees protection for "gender-related identity," meaning dressing and behaving like someone of the opposite sex. On such grounds, liberal judges would be able to enforce legalization of "same-sex marriage" and "civil unions," as happened in Massachusetts. Furthermore, the new law would mean that homosexual indoctrination in the public schools could proceed without restriction, and there would afterward be no way to defend churches and other religious organizations from litigation by homosexuals claiming employment discrimination.

Predictably, the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force was elated by the governor's announcement. The group's executive director, Matt Foreman, said, "This win again shows that dogged work by state and local leaders and activists can surmount enormous odds-and is real salve to a community still hurting from the results of November 2" The reelection of President Bush and an expanded majority in both houses of Congress was seen as a setback for the homosexual lobby. But Foreman and friends recognized the new law in Illinois as "a major advancement for transgender people, both in Illinois and countrywide" Illinois now joins fourteen other states with laws purporting to ban "discrimination against homosexuals."¹⁸

But who really makes policy, and what assurances do we have that our elected officials will actually support and defend the values of the people who elected them? The Bush White House, in early 2005, affirmed a policy established by the Clinton administration that included "sexual orientation" as a protected minority class for federal employees. The head of the Office of Special Counsel in the White House, Scott Bloch, was attacked by homosexual rights groups for his decision to reverse the Clinton policy. He

told reporters that it would be illegal to make sexual orientation a protected class since it's not part of any civil rights law. Furthermore, the measure had been imposed by members of the Clinton team primarily to curry favor with homosexual activist organizations and the well-financed gay lobby in Washington.

Bloch said and did the right things, but his efforts to reverse an unlawful policy were rebuked on March 31, 2004, by White House spokesman Ken Lisaius, who told reporters, "President Bush expects federal agencies to enforce this policy and to ensure that all federal employees are protected from unfair discrimination at work" In other words, faced by strong external pressure from a loud and aggressive homosexual constituency, and their advocates in the media, the White House backed down and left a bad law on the books.¹⁹

If there was ever an argument for Christians to stand up and speak out, this is it. Even with a Christian chief executive and a strongly conservative majority in the seat of power, many times public policy is made by those who have the biggest megaphone. So far, the homosexual lobby has been very successful at brow-beating and intimidating our leaders, and more than once we have seen the White House cave in to the pressure. And that's why we need to mobilize our people, who have a majority vastly larger than the opposition, to speak out on issues of great concern. That's why I established the Traditional Values Coalition twenty-five years ago, to help mobilize and inform that powerful constituency.

For secular society, these issues are purely pragmatic, and they will almost always tend to take the course of least resistance when confronted with two difficult options. The louder and more offensive the homosexual lobby, the easier it is for them to push unprincipled employers and managers over the edge to accept whatever measures the homosexuals want them to accept. According to a recent report in the magazine *Workforce Management*, the transformation of corporate America into a gay-friendly culture is now perceived by many of these people as just another step toward greater peace and harmony in the workplace. They write that:

Gradually, workforce policies are treating sexual orientation on par with other dimensions of diversity, such as race. Some companies embrace gay training because of philosophical beliefs in equality. Others see it as a way to foster teamwork, enhance productivity or woo gay consumers. The 15 million gay men and lesbians in the United States comprise a \$583 billion market, according to consumer-market researcher Packaged Facts and marketing firm Witeck-Combs Com- munications.²⁰

WHERE WERE HEADED

If money is your God, and if you recognize no higher moral authority than satisfying your own interests and needs, then what's to prevent you from following the path of least resistance? Businesses that value profits more than moral balance will naturally gravitate toward policies that fill their coffers. The problem, as I've tried to show throughout these pages, is that there's a lot more to it than that. In the first place, the homosexual lifestyle is no respecter of persons. It will destroy anyone who dabbles in it or who tries to coexist amicably with it.

This "deathstyle" is not the way God's created order was designed to work. But, beyond the political concerns and the purely functional aspects of the agenda, we have also been taught by Scripture, by tradition, and by two thousand years of Judeo-Christian civilization that indulgence in sexual sin will devastate any nation. Nothing could be clearer. And to defy the will of God by casual compromise with a lifestyle that is contrary not only to theology but also to common sense is a deadly proposition, indeed. And this is my ultimate concern.

In a profound and comprehensive volume called *The Bible and Homosexuality*, Dr. Robert A. J. Gagnon examines in amazing depth the record of biblical scholarship on this issue. In that work he reviews the entire span of exegetical literature, including hundreds of texts and related documents that focus on society's understanding of human sexuality, and he offers a clear and compelling case for the sanctity of marriage, as a union between one man and one woman, and the importance of preserving our understanding of and obedience to God's created order.

In an interview with the editors of a theological Web site, posted on the Internet, Gagnon reviewed his analysis of these issues, with an insightful assessment of society's predicament at this hour. His comments, drawing on his scholarly research and the lessons from both history and tradition regarding sexuality and social mores, are powerful and precise. What sort of future does the scholar see for America if the homosexual agenda continues on its current pace? He says:

For the macro-culture generally, approval of homosexual behavior will all but annihilate societal gender norms of any sort, promoting the normalization of the most bizarre elements of the homosexual movement-transsexualism, transvestism-thereby increasing gender identity confusion among the young. Indeed, we can expect a lessening of aversion to various sexual relationships hitherto regarded as sexual perversions-for example, "threesomes;" "open" committed relationships, adult-adolescent sexual relations, and consensual adult sex between close blood relations-owing to a complete abandonment of single divinely-sanctioned, nature-imbedded model for acceptable sexual expression.²¹

In short, unless we come to terms with the devastation created by illicit

sexual behaviors, or unless the AIDS pandemic forces society to stop and reevaluate the consequences of this "lifestyle;" things can only get worse. The home, the school, the workplace, our churches: nothing will be sacred. Nowhere will be safe. And a proliferation of obscene images will sweep like a tidal wave over our culture-at which point only God in His mercy can save us.

One of the early documents of the homosexual movement was a publication called "Waging Peace," which illustrates the subversive nature of the homosexual agenda. Like many of the articles, tracts, and booklets published in the mid-1980s by Marshall Kirk and Hunter Madsen, this one, distributed under the banner of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, focused on the need to hide what homosexuality is actually about in order to gain converts by repetition, desensitization, and deception. In this document, the authors say:

The first order of business is the desensitization of the American public concerning gays and gay rights. To desensitize the public is to help it view homosexuality with indifference instead of with keen emotion. Almost any behavior begins to look normal if you are exposed to enough of it. The way to benumb raw sensitivities about homosexuality is to have a lot of people talk a great deal about the subject in a neutral or supportive way. Constant talk builds the impression that public opinion is at least divided on the subject and that a sizeable segment accepts or even practices homosexuality.²²

This is still going on. The wealth and social privilege enjoyed by homosexuals make them anything but victims. And laws to enforce benefits and full acceptance of homosexuals in the workplace are merely tactics designed to shove the "gay lifestyle" in our faces. Homosexuals are, as one analyst has phrased it, "prime players in a capitalistic society" Wealth brings power, and their higher levels of education means that many homosexuals have knowledge, access, and power to gain an ever-greater share of society's goods.²³

THE CONSEQUENCES OF DENIAL

Thanks to the glorification of homosexuality by Hollywood, television, and the news media, homosexuals have unprecedented access to power at all levels. But even as the campaign of deception tries to spread the message that homosexuals are "just like you and me;" reality paints a very different picture. Statistics from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the National Institute of Mental Health show that men and women in the homosexual community have:

- Higher rates of depression, generalized anxiety disorder, and substance

abuse among homosexual and lesbian youths

- Higher rates of recurrent major depression among homosexual men
- Higher rates of anxiety, mood disorders, and substance abuse among people ages fifteen to fifty-four with samesex partners
- Higher use of mental health services in men and women with same-sex partners.²⁴

Despite the massive education campaign to inform men and women in that community about the need for "safer sex," and despite years of research regarding the deadly consequences of HIV, AIDS, bacterial infections, cancers, and all the major diseases and STDs associated primarily with the homosexual lifestyle, there is no evidence of change.

A 1999 study found that the primary reason for unsafe sex among homosexuals was "poor intentions to use [condoms] and poor norms [in insisting upon the use of condoms]"²⁵

Only drug abusers have a comparable risk of developing HIV and AIDS, yet these high-risk practices continue unabated. How successful have all the educational programs in the schools and the workplace been in alerting people to the risk of contracting serious illnesses through high-risk homosexual practices? Government statistics report that today more people are engaging in more dangerous sexual activities, and at younger ages, than ever before.

Images disseminated by the media, the education establishment, big government, and the courts, pandering to the homosexual movement, are changing the American culture in shocking ways. We are never exposed to scenes of emaciated young men in darkened wards dying of AIDS and colorectal cancers. We don't see images of drugaddicted teenagers on life support who have destroyed themselves by experimenting with the "gay lifestyle" Instead, we see what Hollywood wants us to see: movie stars, celebrities, and glittering socialites who embrace the agenda and vilify anyone who dares to say that all is not as it seems.

Free speech in many places is now "hate speech" The universities are centers of intolerance and indoctrination, and the workplace is in danger of becoming a truth-free zone. Gay rights, in the end, turns out to be about power. It's a battle that's being waged in the media marketplace by clever marketing and indoctrination. There's a price to pay for standing up for what's right, as we have seen over and over again in these pages. Those who resist maybe persecuted. They maybe hounded in the workplace while homosexuals and lesbians are given the red carpet treatment. They may be fired for expressing their views and refusing to participate in diversity training. But the price for compromise is so much greater.

Deb Price, a lesbian columnist and activist, speaks for many in that movement who feel that religious convictions and biblical standards are meaningless. Arguing against the Religious Liberty Protection Act passed by Congress in 1999, Price said that: "Religion should not be treated as a 'Get Out of Jail Free' card that lets people pick and choose which laws to obey."²

⁶ Activists like Deb Price believe faith is irrelevant. Constitutional guarantees of religious freedom may be ignored, she says, if religious beliefs conflict with the homosexual agenda. And I'm sorry to say, she's not alone. Price's view is shared by an ever-growing segment of the population, including many of your representatives in Congress.

Even California's Republican governor, Arnold Schwarzenegger, seems to agree. In an interview on ABC TV, he said that "religion should have no effect on politics" This is completely puzzling to me, especially from a man who has indicated his interest in running for president one day. How can anyone, especially government leaders, make decisions when they have no foundation of moral beliefs? After all, it was our first president, George Washington, who said in his farewell: "Of all the dispositions and habits, which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens"

President Ronald Reagan once posed an important question to a group of dignitaries attending an ecumenical prayer breakfast near the end of his first term. He said, "The frustrating thing is that those who are attacking religion claim they are doing it in the name of tolerance and freedom and open-mindedness. Question: Isn't the real truth that they are intolerant of religion? That they refuse to tolerate its importance in our lives?"²⁷

That's an important question, and we're still waiting for the answer. Until those who are promoting nondiscrimination policies in the workplace (and elsewhere in American society) come to grips with the true meaning of "freedom and justice for all;" there can be no justice at all. And that's why we fight.

TAKING OVER THE SCHOOLS

The homosexual movement is really an outgrowth of... the broader humanistic revolution that has swept this country to the point that people cannot say anything is right or wrong; everything is geared toward tolerance, and there is no truth. You are allowed to look for it, but you can't find it because then you are narrow and bigoted. It's the end game of liberalism itself that says that the individual is the sovereign authority, not God.¹

-ROBERT KNIGHT "HOMOSEXUALITY IN
AN AGE OF CONSENT"

IT WAS ONLY a matter of time until the crusade to seduce morality and banish self-restraint in this country would invade the nation's schools. The architects of the homosexual campaign of deception and intimidation made their plans known as early as 1972. Item number six of the now infamous "gay rights" platform that year called for, "Federal encouragement and support for sex education courses, prepared and taught by gay women and men, presenting homosexuality as a valid, healthy preference and lifestyle as a viable alternative to heterosexuality."²

When I first read that, I thought, They want what? The very idea is preposterous! Homosexuals, who have made a religion of practices banned by every great society known to man ... who have a life expectancy barely half that of the average heterosexual ... who contract and propagate contagions that have devastated entire nations ... who are sexually immature, morally irresponsible, and emotionally unstable ... who are unfaithful to their partners ... who engage in aberrant sexual acts with as many as five hundred different partners in their attenuated lifetimes ... who are constantly on the prowl for erotic adventures ... who insult legitimate minorities by co-opting the language of civil rights ... and who disseminate hatred and violence in the name of tolerance and diversity... these people want the federal government to encourage and support the teaching of their lifestyle-by homosexuals no less-to America's children? Whom are they kidding?

Yes, the idea is perverse. What kind of people would permit such a thing? But what is even more perverse is that, by intimidation, by persistence, and by the unprincipled complicity of liberal public school administrators and

their far-left teachers unions, the gay lobby has in fact accomplished that goal, taking over the public schools right before our eyes. As a result, today government schools all across this country are being transformed into centers of homosexual recruitment and indoctrination.

The same schools that have utterly failed to prepare children academically for life in a demanding and complex world, who rank consistently at the bottom in head-to-head comparisons with the schools of other industrialized countries, have now made homosexuality the centerpiece of their unholy worldview. And day by day, America's children are being brainwashed into wide-eyed and unquestioning acceptance of an agenda that will destroy their lives and threaten America's future.

No END IN SIGHT

There's nothing new in the attempt to pass off an outlandish falsehood as absolute truth. Adolf Hitler's "big lie" was precisely that. It was an outrageous bluff based on a very simple proposition. If you want to make people believe something that is utterly false, then two things are needed: First, make the lie really big. Second, tell it often. The bolder and more audacious the lie, the more likely it will be swallowed, hook, line, and sinker. This is how the Nazis were able to exterminate six million Jews without setting off alarm bells in German society. It's how Big Brother, in George Orwell's classic novel 1984, was able to sell the idea that peace is war, ignorance is knowledge, and hate is love. And it's how the ACLU was able to misinterpret the First Amendment to erect a "wall of separation between church and state"

The big lie of the homosexual agenda is that gay men and lesbians are just like everyone else, with the same hopes, dreams, and desires. This is the argument behind "civil unions" and "same-sex marriage" Why, homosexuals are just ordinary folks whose families are a little different. Except for that, they're just like you and me. Elementary school libraries have stacks of books like *Heather Has Two Mommies* and *Daddy's Roommate* that attempt to normalize homosexuality in the minds of children, to prevent them from seeing or knowing what's really going on in most homosexual relationships. And the film *It's Elementary* has been forced into the schools by the NEA and other pro-homosexual groups. The local school districts in many places are beginning to fight back against this forced indoctrination by the homosexual lobby, but there's much more to be done and the battle is far from over.³

If enough people actually penetrate the smokescreen of lies and deception that has been put up by the homosexual lobby, the big lie will be exposed, and their entire house of cards will come tumbling down around them. Believe me, moral clarity is the last thing gay activists want. And that's why they are so willing to fight to the death to make sure the lie is never

exposed.

By propagating disinformation and cozying up to large liberal constituencies, homosexuals have taken on victim status.⁴ Nearly every school child today is being told that churches are breeding grounds for evil. Boy Scouts who pledge "to be physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight" are enemy number one. So is anyone who says homosexuality is abnormal and undesirable. Such people are labeled as racist, homophobic, and a danger to society. The mantra of the homosexual movement is that sex is for everyone, young and old, and any sort of restriction on experimentation is archaic and dangerous. Why, it's those right-wing Christians and religious extremists that you have to watch out for. Or so our children are being told.

The National Education Association (NEA) publishes teachers' guides and fact sheets with techniques for incorporating gay and lesbian topics into lesson plans. One such guide includes a list of twenty recommendations for "Addressing the Concerns of Gays and Lesbians in Education" This and other publications assembled by the NEA's gay and lesbian caucus encourage teachers to invite lesbians and gays to visit the schools, to make sure that same-sex parents are included in all discussions of family, and to keep talk of sexuality and sexual identity open and easy for youngsters, from kindergarten through high school.

In addition to the volumes of literature teachers are required to access for the classroom, there are hundreds of homosexual Web sites catering to school children, and teachers are told to encourage their students to visit these places. And what will they find there? Youth.org, as just one example, is a recruiting Web site for children and teens. Resources offered on the site help children deal with such questions as, "I might be gay; what do I do?" and "Porn on the Internet and its relation to gay youth" Predictably, the advice they give is all in favor of experimenting with sexuality and getting rid of the guilt young people would naturally feel for dabbling in promiscuous behaviors.

Several publishing companies that cater exclusively to homosexuals make their catalogs and Internet resources available to members of the major teachers unions, such as the NEA and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT). In addition, school administrators, principals, and teachers receive regular mailings from many of them. Clearly, it's not just children who are being indoctrinated: there's a whole recruiting network for teachers and administrators in the schools, and books by propagandists like Kevin Jennings, founder of the Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network, to help formalize the indoctrination process. I've included a brief sampling of some of these at the end of this chapter.

WHAT'S REALLY AT STAKE

When writer and researcher Tony Marco analyzed the scope of the homosexual assault on American culture, he prepared a list of six things that parents can expect if gay activists succeed in their quest. Here's what he said:⁵

1. Schools will be forced to hire openly homosexual teachers and teach children in all subject areas that homosexuality is a normal and attractive behavior.
2. Employees will be forced to "value" homosexual behavior, or they will lose their jobs.
3. College students will be forced to "value" homosexual behavior-or be suspended from their schools.
4. Landlords will be forced to rent to homosexuals, thereby subsidizing and protecting behaviors that the landlords and other renters may consider unhealthy and perverse.
5. Churches and religious ministries will be forced, against their strongly held beliefs, to hire practicing homosexuals for staff positions. Further, they will be threatened with criminal action and loss of their tax-exempt status for preaching against homosexual behavior. This, of course, is already happening in many places.
6. Taxpayers and consumers will be forced to foot the bill for "spousal benefits" for homosexual "domestic partners"-including such things as lower tax rates and comprehensive insurance coverage not only for illnesses but for elective sex-change operations.

Is there any doubt that all of these things are already happening? So far the homosexual lobby hasn't been able to enforce all their demands with the authority of the law behind them, but that day isn't far off if Americans don't wake up and take swift and appropriate action.

To see how homosexuals respond to reasonable dissent, consider the case of Mrs. Janie Hill and a group of Christians in Wichita Falls, Texas, who addressed the city council of that city regarding the presence of books such as *Daddy's Roommate* and *Heather Has Two Mommies* in the children's section of the public library. Those books, which paint a flattering picture of children in homosexual homes, are deceptive and disingenuous, and lead youngsters with no knowledge of such things to accept propositions about sexuality and family relationships that are morally wrong and counter to the interests and desires of a civilized society. But, of course, such things are holy grail to defenders of the "gay lifestyle"

When Mrs. Hill and her group were allowed to speak, they pointed out that the books in question not only promote homosexuality to children but violate Texas law. Subsequently, the council voted on the idea of creating a

restricted-access area for controversial children's books. However, council member Dan Shine and three others angrily rejected the idea. At that point, Mrs. Hill called for voters to use their authority as citizens to oust Shine and company in the upcoming city elections and to replace them with people with strong moral character.

In light of the brewing controversy, the council said that if Mrs. Hill could gather the signatures of three hundred library cardholders who felt those books should be moved to an adult area of the library, then they would order the change. And that's when the fur started to fly. Shouts and protests were voiced in council chambers and for days later. Soon thereafter, the ACLU and Americans United for the Separation of Church and State weighed in. The ACLU threatened to file suit against the city, condemning the resolution allowing the people to decide. At that point the city council caved in, and Heather Has Two Mommies and Daddy's Roommate went straight back to the children's section.⁶

This is a sad example of what has happened to moral judgment in our cities, but it is by no means a new one. The names may be different, but the circumstances are the same. Time and again, hardworking mothers and fathers who want to uphold moral standards and raise their children in a safe and sane environment are defeated by a wellfinanced anti-Christian lobby who have bought into the homosexual agenda. And what makes such stories all the more heartbreaking is the fact that America's children are the prize. That's what the Left is after: to indoctrinate and recruit the next generation of children into the gay deathstyle.

AN ONGOING WAR

There are many such stories, but an incident that happened in 1984 helped me to see firsthand what is happening in the schools. In the fall of that year, I read an article in the Los Angeles Times announcing a new program called Project 10 at Fairfax High School in Los Angeles. It was a plan for reaching out to students who were "experiencing problems because of their sexual orientation" The teacher/counselor, they said, was Virginia Uribe, and each day during lunch hour she was holding open forum at lunch tables in the patio area of the school. I was surprised to see that story in print because I knew how subtle these people usually try to be.

I immediately called the principal of that school and discussed with him what the homosexual agenda is all about. He told me he didn't necessarily agree with Ms. Uribe, but the meetings were held during lunch hour, and she was only talking to them about sexual orientation. At that point I asked about something else I'd seen in the article, a third-floor resource center. To my utter shock, he said, "I don't know about that. I've never been up there. But it's open to the public" So I said, "Don't you think it's about time you found out?"

The minute I hung up, I got in my car and drove over to Fairfax High School. In those days you didn't need to check in at the office, so I went upstairs to the "resource center" and began looking around. One of the things I found was a paperback book titled *One Teenager in Ten*. It said that one teenager in ten is homosexual, and it featured several testimonies by people who had their first homosexual experience as teens or young adults and liked it. It was nothing but a propaganda piece, but I was floored by one of those stories about a girl who was seduced by her teacher in a dance class. The story described in revolting detail how the teacher had undressed this young girl and initiated lesbian sex with her.

I thought, This is molestation! This book is advocating homosexual relations between children and teachers. So I put the book back where I found it and returned to my office. At that point I called a number of our supporting and activist churches. After consulting with them, I decided the best thing to do was to get a copy of that book and go to the next school board meeting. So that's what I did, and when the time came for me to speak, I began reading from that chapter where the teacher seduces a fourteen-year-old girl.

As I was reading, several board members spoke up angrily. "Rev. Sheldon;" they shouted, "this is pornography. How dare you come in here and read that to us!"

When they scolded me, I put the book down and said, "Thank you for making my point. This book can be found in the resource center, organized by Virginia Uribe, at Fairfax High School, right here in this city." I also told them they needed to get the principal to bring Ms. Uribe down to the school board so they could find out what else she was up to. And that's just what they did.

That incident was just the beginning of a long-term pitched battle between Virginia Uribe and me. And the battle is still ongoing. There are now homosexual clubs in every public high school in Los Angeles. But that was also the first awakening for many churches, pastors, and concerned parents in that city to the war for our children's souls that is taking place in the Greater Los Angeles United School District.

CLASSROOM PREDATORS

The fact is, children have long been the target of homosexual activists. The whole reason for the existence of the Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network (GLSEN) is to recruit children into the lifestyle. Since the organization was established in 1990, GLSEN has established more than twenty-five hundred Gay Straight Alliance (GSA) clubs on junior high and high school campuses around the country. The group's founder, Kevin Jennings, is a former high school history teacher who came out of the closet

while still a student at Concord Academy, an exclusive prep school in the Boston suburbs. He announced his homosexuality during a talk in chapel and later created the first club for homosexuals at the school.

But make no mistake: GLSEN exists to recruit children into the homosexual lifestyle. Columnist and author Hans Zeiger, a student at Hillsdale College in Michigan and a veteran of the Left's war against the Boy Scouts, puts it very well. He says, "GLSEN is a cultural terrorist organization, and, as former Secretary of Education Rod Paige noted in February, the NEA is an educational terrorist organization.'⁷ What they are unable to accomplish by the legitimate power of persuasion, these groups force on the nation by intimidating and terrorizing their opponents-tactics they learned from the ACLU, who learned them from the Communist Party USA.

Zeiger writes:

Since 1996, GLSEN has organized the annual Homosexual Day of Silence in schools to raise awareness of closeted and open homosexuals who supposedly cannot speak for fear of homophobia. In April, several thousand schools recognized the Homosexual Day of Silence, many with official administrative and teacher support. GLSEN sponsors Pink Proms in hundreds of schools for students of alternative sexual orientations.⁸

In addition, transgender activists, in cooperation with GLSEN and others, actively promote cross-dressing and sex change operations to kids in the public schools.

Groups like GLSEN force their way into the schools by claiming that homosexual and transgender students need to feel safe and that homosexual support groups are the answer. They claim that homosexual teens have high suicide rates because of the pressure they feel from unsupportive parents and conservatives, which makes it easier to convince school boards and reluctant parents of the need for such groups.⁹ But when the pressure tactics fail, GLSEN won't hesitate to bring legal action against any school that refuses to allow them to recruit on campus.

Predictably, the American Civil Liberties Union volunteered to serve as the enforcement arm of GLSEN. In January 2004, an ACLU-GLSEN coalition won a major victory against the independent school district of Morgan Hill, California. The suit claimed that the school district had failed to protect six homosexual students from harassment. As part of the million-dollar settlement, school district employees were forced to attend pro-homosexual sensitivity-training classes. And beginning with the 2004-2005 school year, Morgan Hill schools would be required to instruct all ninth grade students on how to have "positive attitudes about homosexuality"¹⁰

As part of a campaign to recruit sexually confused teens, GLSEN actively

recruits so-called "questioning" and "transgender youth" More recently, GLSEN and other homosexual activists have even tried to push the idea that genital deformities found in some newborns are evidence of a third sex-and not simply a birth defect. Reports we have produced at the Traditional Values Coalition dealing with these issues explain what's going on there and shed light on the effort to confuse and deconstruct the biological realities of male and female gender.¹¹

WHAT DID You LEARN TODAY, JOHNNY?

Recruiting innocent children into the homosexual lifestyle is insidious, but recruiting and equipping teachers as agents and enforcers of their agenda is wickedness at a whole new level. That is, in fact, the mission of another group called the Gay, Lesbian and Straight Teachers Network (GLSTN). The goal of this organization is to influence educational policy at all levels. With more than four thousand teachers, students, and parents on their membership roles, GLSTN pushes a strongly pro-homosexual message and offers seminars on "gay-friendly curriculum development"

At the beginning of each school year, GLSTN promotes a "Backto-School Campaign" that encourages homosexuals in business, academia, and the professions to take part in an aggressive letter-writing campaign "to change the 'hearts and minds' of leaders who control our schools" In other words, homosexuals are asked to write their former principals and teachers to tell them of their struggles and to admonish them to be more open, tolerant, and accepting of homosexuality in the classroom.

On top of that, GLSTN distributes its recruitment videos (such as Teaching Respect for All and It's Elementary: Talking About Gay Issues in School) to teachers and administrators all over the country. The film It's Elementary would have to rank among the most notorious indoctrination films ever produced. Some professional researchers have even compared it to the work of Adolf Hitler's propagandist, Leni Riefenstahl, whose films of blonde-haired, blue-eyed Aryan children were used by the Nazis to foster the notion of a "master race" destined to rule the world. From start to finish, It's Elementary is designed to recruit and desensitize teachers to homosexuality and to present homosexuals as innocent victims of the Religious Right.

The feature-length documentary pushes what it labels "multicultural education" and provides "a window into how teachers can find ways to teach children about gay issues" to elementary and middle-school children. But the film goes further than that, including outright hate sessions where homosexuals talk openly about being victimized by Christians and moral conservatives. The purpose is to create an image of the homosexual as victim and to portray anyone who refuses to accept homosexuals on their own terms as bigots and homophobes.

What parents and school officials need to understand is that the organizers of these groups see your children as their property. They believe they're justified in changing the thoughts and habits of kids by forcing them to deal with complex social, sexual, and moral issues that, in most cases, are years beyond their grasp. The objective is to make children sympathize with the homosexual agenda and to become defenders of "homosexual rights." And by inventing a new category of "questioning" youth, the goal is to take advantage of the naivete and innocence of children who, at such a young age, aren't certain what they feel about sexuality or their own sexual identity. Thus, kids are ushered into the lifestyle, believing that experimenting with homosexuality is just another way of discovering who you really are.

There's no question that tolerance for differences of opinion is a good thing. But tolerance for evil is insidious and, in this case, potentially deadly as well. That's why our two-thousand-year-old Judeo-Christian tradition forbids homosexuality and warns that those who trespass against God's creative order are treading on dangerous ground indeed. Individuals who scorn these ancient prohibitions bring despair and disease upon themselves and others, and nations that condone or endorse sexual sin are condemned. This history lesson, as I said in the beginning, is only too clear. Yet, millions have chosen to ignore these truths.

Let me say it again. Never has the American Psychological Association or any journal of medicine, any school of medicine, or the National Academy of Sciences ever said that they have found a "gay gene" And, of course, they never will, because it simply doesn't exist. There is no scientific evidence of a genetic basis for homosexual behavior. The National Association for Research and Therapy of Homosexuality (NARTH), headed by Dr. Joseph Nicolosi, offers a wealth of information dealing with the "born gay" myth, and this is what teachers and administrators ought to be sharing with our children.¹² It is no sin to feel compassion for someone who is wrestling with their sexual identity or who may have experimented with homosexuality. But to allow such a person to continue in that lifestyle without a just, fair, scientific, and biblical warning of the consequences of long-term involvement in the lifestyle is to condemn them to a life of misery and a premature death.

GESTAPO TACTICS

Homosexual activists have made it clear since the early 1970s that they have a plan for overhauling straight America and imposing their own brand of morality on the American culture. In a disturbingly frank interview for a homosexual Web site, radical activist Matt Foreman told a reporter that, as executive director of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, his goal is not to persuade critics of his point of view but to utterly defeat the defenders of traditional morality, by any means necessary. In the interview

he said:

I'm also interested in going after, politically, local legislators and leaders that have launched these anti-gay initiatives. "We beat you, now we're gonna go back and we're going to affirmatively punish you"-people who launch this stuff, so that they understand not only that they're not going to win, but that there are consequences to it. We would set up a PAC and go in and terrify them with a credible challenge.... So we go in, for a modest investment of money, and torture these people, which would give me endless satisfaction. And the word would go out very quickly, "You know what, this really isn't worth it."¹³

Needless to say, gestapo tactics and intimidation of this sort have made it possible for Foreman and his fellow homosexuals to win victories all over the country in the past thirty years. In California, a prohomosexual legislature has passed dozens of bills that give aid and comfort to that state's affluent homosexual community while clearly threatening the speech, religion, and free association rights of everyone else. Gay activists lobbied for a bill supporting homosexual marriage, an antidiscrimination bill that would have a corrosive effect on businesses, a hate crimes bill that would stifle free speech, and a bill that requires businesses to provide health benefits for "domestic partners" And, by threats and intimidation, they got them all.

More disturbing, however, are laws that have been passed by the legislature requiring California public schools to promote homosexuality as a positive lifestyle. One of Gray Davis's first initiatives as governor was to sign new legislation expanding gay rights in the state. One such bill was AB 1785, which required all public schools to promote "diversity" and develop "tolerance" programs. A task force appointed by the state's superintendent of public instruction distributed guidelines for implementation of these policies. Those guidelines included:

1. Accommodate "transgendered" students in public school locker rooms
2. End the right of parents to remove their children from surveys of sexual practices
3. Require teachers to receive "diversity training" in order to be certified
4. Establish gay support groups and "diversity czars" at all public schools ¹⁴

No wonder Davis was successfully recalled and sent packing by the voters of California in 2004. But these are just a few examples of the increasingly aggressive tactics of the gay rights crowd and their lackeys. The goal is to take over the government and push through bills of this sort that the people themselves would never approve.

Instead of merely "defending" victims, as they claim, homosexual activists want to undermine the historic institutions and values of our culture. This is not just my opinion, but the stated goal of many on that side of this issue. "We are essentially a radical movement, and in as far as we are successful we do indeed break down the hegemony of certain traditional values;" admits one gay rights activist. His statement, printed in the homosexual newspaper NY Native, goes even further by claiming that homosexual activists "need to defend our own minorities, whether they be man-boy lovers, transvestites, or sadomasochists;" because of the importance to their whole agenda of eroding this country's moral boundaries.¹⁵

If you ever doubted it, there is the evidence that the homosexual community is waging war on America, and there is apparently no limit to how far their aggressive campaign will go. In 2004, we discovered that the ACLU had reached an agreement with the Pentagon to ban military bases from sponsoring Boy Scout troops. Why? Because the Boy Scouts have successfully resisted admitting homosexual Scout leaders. Target stores banned Salvation Army bell ringers and prevented them from raising funds to help the poor and needy in front of their stores. Why? Because The Salvation Army refused to provide health insurance to "domestic partners."¹⁶ And a federal judge ruled that universities can prohibit military recruiters from campus. Why? Because the military, instead of accepting openly gay service members, decided to institute a "don't ask, don't tell" policy for homosexuals.

WAGING WAR ON THE SCHOOLS

If stealth and deceit fail, the homosexual avengers take the direct approach. One such approach is what GLSEN organizers call the "Day of Silence" in public schools. This event is supposed to give students a chance to protest discrimination against homosexual, bisexual, and transgender students on junior high and high school campuses. In reality, the event is designed to intimidate and silence opposition to the homosexual agenda and the recruiting efforts of groups like GLSEN in the schools. Those who oppose the agenda are labeled bigots and accused of promoting hatred and violence against homosexuals. Simultaneously, they push for restriction of hate speech in the schools and regulations that ban any kind of criticism of homosexuality. Here again, the same individuals who scream loudest at any attempt to limit homosexual conduct are only too willing to censor, silence, and vilify their opponents.¹⁷

American school children have an instinctive desire to defend the underdog and to speak up for the rights of those who aren't getting a fair shake. This is natural and understandable, but homosexual activists discovered they could take advantage of this instinct by first claiming victim status and then giving students a way to protest. Another example of this was "No Name-Calling Week," a pseudo-event created by GLSEN with the aid

of a New York publishing giant.

The first "No Name-Calling Week" took place March 1-5, 2004. The event was inspired by the 2003 release of a Simon & Schuster book called *The Misfits* by homosexual author James Howe. The book is a fictional account of the struggles of a homosexual middle-school student. And "No Name-Calling Week" shamelessly promotes not only a commercial product but also unquestioned advocacy of the homosexual lifestyle among children who, as responsible medical specialists have said, are developmentally immature and unequipped for the types of moral questions that are involved.¹⁸

But the exploitation of young people in the schools, unfortunately, doesn't stop there. Another program being pushed by GLSEN is a lesson plan for teachers dealing with cross-dressing and so-called "nongender conforming clothing." The lesson is titled, "what's with the Dress, Jack?" and focuses on the story of an Indian tribe that encouraged its children to wear "the clothes that suit them best and play the games they most enjoy, without the limits of stereotypical gender roles"¹⁹

The lesson, for children in kindergarten through sixth grade, includes questions that encourage children not to accept society's ideas of gender roles but to find their own. For example, one question teachers are to pose to their students asks: "What makes us think of certain clothing, activities, and things as being only for girls or only for boys?" Another asks: "Were men able to wear dresses in the past, and not today?" And kids are taught the Native American term for a homosexual man, "two spirit"

Just in case any school district may decide they don't need to use these materials to further confuse their students about gender and sex roles, the National Center for Lesbian Rights, with the aid of GLSEN, published a booklet to give administrators another reason why they ought to require all teachers to affirm homosexuality on their campuses. The booklet, entitled "Fifteen Expensive Reasons Why Safe Schools Legislation Is in Your State's Best Interest;" lists court cases like the one at Morgan City, California, where huge settlements have been won by the ACLU and where judges have ruled in favor of promoting homosexuality in the schools.

SEX WITH KIDS

Gerald Hannon is a homosexual pedophile who openly lobbies for the abolition of "age of consent" laws. While age of consent laws vary from country to country and from state to state, all of them set a minimum age below which an adult is prohibited from having sexual contact with a child. But Hannon and his allies want to decriminalize sex with children. As part of his campaign, Hannon is now pushing for recruitment programs in the public schools.

In a disturbing book published by New York University Press, Lavender Culture, Hannon reveals what he's really after: lowering the age of consent so homosexuals can have sex with children. Homosexuals need teenagers in their movement, he says, and where will they get them? "The answer is to proselytize," says Hannon. "To attract young people to the gay movement in large numbers should be the challenge to the next phase of the movement. It is a challenge we have set ourselves."²⁰

Hannon then goes on to describe the importance of establishing homosexual clubs with adult advisors and mentors to initiate children into the homosexual lifestyle. Children are to be lured in and then indoctrinated to believe that parents are a "constant source of exasperation and amusement" To succeed in their task, adult homosexuals have to separate children from their parents and cause them to question the values they have been taught at home. And all this is being done, thanks to the NEA and cooperative school administrators, at taxpayer expense.

So how should we react to such news? Parents need to rise up and demand an end to homosexual recruitment in the public schools. Furthermore, they need to demand an accounting for how their tax dollars are being spent. They should also demand an end to all programs implemented by the schools, teachers, and their unions that undermine parental authority and the moral values they are trying to instill in their children at home.

People like Gerald Hannon have nothing but contempt for parental authority. In a major research paper on Hannon and his tactics, Dr. Judith Reisman, author of the outstanding books on Alfred Kinsey cited in chapter two, writes that, "As the homosexual movement has long advocated ending age of consent laws, those familiar with the movement literature realize that parental fears of pederasts and pedophiles using school access to recruit children into sex is realistic."²¹

It's absolutely certain, she says, that as homosexuals continue to make inroads into the public schools, more children will be molested and initiated into the world of homosexuality. In the paper Dr. Reisman refers to research conducted by Dr. Gene Abel, who compared the rate of homosexual molestation with that of heterosexual molestation. What he found was that, in a sample of 153 self-confessed homosexual pederasts, they had assaulted a total of 22,981 victims-or approximately 150 boys per offender. Of the heterosexual offenders who had molested girls, with a total of 4,435 molestations, the average was just under 20 victims by each pedophile. According to Dr. Abel's study, the incidence of molestation among homosexual offenders is a rate five times greater than that for heterosexual offenders.²²

Are there no limits to what homosexuals will do to satisfy their lusts? One can only wonder how far things have to go before all Americans recognize

the legitimate evil of this movement. Scott Whiteman, who works with the Parents Rights Commission in the state of Massachusetts, made up his mind to find out how far things could go and signed up to attend a "Teach Out" sponsored by GLSEN on the campus of Tufts University in March 2000. At the conference, Whiteman secretly tape-recorded several workshops, and what he heard was eye opening, to say the least.

One workshop was called, "What They Didn't Tell You About Queer Sex & Sexuality in Health Class: A Workshop for Youth Only, Ages 14-21" In that session, Whiteman listened to two lesbians and a homosexual male (all certified HIV instructors in that state) teach children how to engage in homosexual "fisting," which involves thrusting one's fist and arm into the anus of a sex partner. The instructors discussed pros and cons of swallowing semen after oral sex, and tables outside the classrooms were stacked high with even more perverse literature and other how-to guides.

One workshop dealt with distribution of "pocket sex kits" for teens. Each kit contained two condoms, two antiseptic moist towelettes, and six bandages. According to the teen who was handing out kits to attendees, the bandages were for "when the sex got really rough" After a conservative Internet site in Massachusetts revealed details of what Scott Whiteman had seen that day, the popular Internet news site WorldNetDaily picked up the story, and it soon took off like a rocket, making headlines worldwide.²³

Since then, the head of the Massachusetts Department of Education has fired one lesbian HIV instructor, accepted another lesbian's resignation, and abolished the position held by the homosexual HIV instructor. As a reward for exposing the truth to the light of day, Scott Whiteman and Brian Carmenker of the Parents Rights Coalition were sued by a lesbian instructor and a teenager at the conference who claimed their privacy rights had been violated. The plaintiffs lost that suit and won no damages. Fortunately, the judge had put a gag order on everyone involved to prevent further distortions. But the real questions should be: What about the privacy rights of our children? What about the moral sanity of the classroom? And why has the public school classroom been allowed to become a place for homosexual recruiters to push their sordid agenda?

TURNING THE TABLES

What is happening in places like California and Massachusetts is only a tiny sample of what's happening all over the country today, even in places where you would never guess that such deceit and political maneuvering could have an effect. Kevin Jennings once described the tactics that he and his colleagues in GLSEN have used to a group of homosexuals at a Human Rights Campaign Fund Leadership Conference in 1995. In those remarks, Jennings said:

If the Radical Right can succeed in portraying us as preying on children, we will lose. Their language-"promoting homosexuality" as one example-is laced with subtle and not-so-subtle innuendo that we are "after their kids" We must learn from the abortion struggle, where the clever claiming of the term "pro-life" allowed those who opposed abortion on demand to frame the issue to their advantage, to make sure that we do not allow ourselves to be painted into a corner before the debate ever begins.²⁴

Jennings then went on to say that in Massachusetts the reframing of the issue was key to their success in persuading the Governor's Commission on Gay and Lesbian Youth to side with the homosexual advocates. He said, "We immediately seized upon the opponent's calling card-safety-and explained how homophobia represents a threat to students' safety by creating a climate where violence, name-calling, health problems, and suicide are common."²⁵

Titling our report, "Making Schools Safe for Gay and Lesbian Youth," we automatically threw our opponents onto the defensive and stole their best line of attack. This framing short-circuited their arguments and left them back-pedaling from day one. Finding the effective frame for your community is the key to victory. It must be linked to universal values that everyone in the community has in common. In Massachusetts, no one could speak up against our frame and say, "Why, yes, I do think students should kill themselves" This allowed us to set the terms for the debate.²⁶

In the world where most of us live, such tactics are known as "bait and switch." What Jennings and company set out to do was to promise one thing-safety for all children-and deliver something else entirely: homosexual recruitment, molestation, and initiation.

Homosexuals promoted the issue of "safety" for "gay teens," and they pushed the notion that homosexual teenagers were committing suicide in record numbers. To do that they used bogus statistics created by a homosexual social worker in San Francisco. The study, "Gay Male and Lesbian Youth Suicide" by Paul Gibson, was included as a supporting document in a 1989 report on youth suicide published by the United States Department of Health and Human Services.²⁷ I had a lengthy meeting with Dr. Louis Sullivan, who was Secretary of Health and Human Services at the time, and subsequently he thoroughly repudiated Gibson's exaggerated report.²⁸ Furthermore, Dr. David Shaffer, an analyst from Columbia University, concluded that Gibson's data was "more hocus pocus than math" All the same, the timing and placement couldn't have been better for promoters of the homosexual agenda.²⁹

If there's one thing we need to learn from this sad litany about how the

agenda has taken over the nation's public schools, it's that we cannot afford to give up or to withdraw from this fight before the battle is won. America's children are too precious to us and to the future of this nation to entrust them to the destructive forces of the public schools. We must do everything in our power to stop this agenda, and then take steps to overwhelm and defeat the enemies of morality and truth. If there was ever an issue that demanded a strong response, this is it. If there was ever a time when we needed an informed and responsive outcry from concerned parents and their advocates and representatives in high places, now is the time, and this is the issue.

How TO FIGHT BACK IN THE SCHOOLS

It can be done. Just a few years ago in New York City, a single feisty grandmother, Mary Cummins, was so fed up with the trendy "Children of the Rainbow" curriculum being pushed by the education elites on the Manhattan School Board that she called our office. We arranged to meet in New York to talk about how she ought to respond. After that meeting, Mary got on the phone and rallied thousands of like-minded parents to her cause. She stepped in, stuck with it, and got the media and the churches behind her. That honest woman not only stopped the curriculum, but she also managed to get the chancellor of New York schools relieved of his job.³⁰

In Pennsylvania, Peg Luksik led a grassroots campaign that fought for and pushed through legislation that gave local municipalities the authority to throw out "outcomes-based education" in their public schools.³¹

And in Colorado, outraged parents and concerned voters tossed out virtually the entire school board in the city of Littleton and replaced them with a slate of pro-family, pro-America, pro-education leaders who were committed to restoring the character and integrity of the schools.³² And, with God's help, we can do all of that and more.

In the homosexual manifesto of Marshall Kirk and Erastes Pill (aka Hunter Madsen), "The Overhauling of Straight America," the authors told us what they were up to.

In the early stages of any campaign to reach straight America, the masses should not be shocked and repelled by premature exposure to homosexual behavior itself. Instead, the imagery of sex should be downplayed and gay-rights should be reduced to an abstract social question as much as possible. First, let the camel get his nose inside the tent-and only later his unsightly derriere!³³

Well, today we can see that unsightly derriere only too well, and it's high time to kick the whole unsightly camel out of the tent. And what better motivation could we have than the battle to save America's children?

Here's a brief sampling from a list made available on the Internet of books from several pro-homosexual bookstores, publishers, and distributors that promote homosexuality in the schools.³⁴

■ **Becoming Visible: A Reader in Gay and Lesbian History for High School and College**, Kevin Jennings, \$9.95. Ready for immediate classroom use and drawing from both primary and secondary sources, this reader covers over two thousand years of history and a diverse range of cultures. Each selection is followed by questions that could be assigned to students and suggestions for classroom activities. The readings are suitable for age levels from ninth grade through college, but the book will also be welcomed by general readers seeking insight into gay and lesbian history.

■ **Coming Out of the Classroom Closet: Gay and Lesbian Students, Teachers, and Curricula**, Karen Harbeck, \$14.95. Looks closely at issues surrounding homosexuality in schools. Includes a history of treatment of homosexuals in schools, legal rights of lesbians and gays, effects of internalized homophobia, lesbian and gay student perceptions of counselor, and images of lesbians and gays in textbooks. Required reading for all persons concerned about continuing to provide high-quality education.

■ **Lesbian Teachers: An Invisible Presence**, Madiha Didi Khayatt, \$21.95. Using an analysis that combines feminist concepts of patriarchy with Gramsci's notion of hegemony, this book is an institutional ethnography that begins from the standpoint of lesbian teachers, but, at the same time, locates their experiences in the immediate social organization from which they arise and that gives them meaning.

■ **One Teacher in Ten: Gay and Lesbian Educators Tell Their Stories**, Kevin Jennings, \$9.95. Gay and lesbian teachers have traditionally dwelt in the deepest of closets. But increasing numbers of young people are now served by teachers who are out proud. Here, for the first time, educators from all regions of the country tell about their struggles and victories as they put their own careers at risk in their fight for justice.

■ **School's Out: The Impact of Gay and Lesbian Issues on America's Schools**, Dan Woog, \$11.95. This book explores the lives and worlds of the hundreds of thousands of gay and lesbian students, teachers, principals, coaches, counselors, and their heterosexual allies. Gay and lesbian issues are among the most important faced today. This book is filled with true stories, some inspiring, some frightening.

■ **Tilting the Tower: Lesbians Teaching Queer Subjects**, Linda Garber, \$15.95. Explores the status of lesbians and lesbian studies in the high school and university classroom and in the academy. Bringing together high school teachers, community college and four-year university professors, graduate students, and tenured program directors, the volume documents the voices, personal experiences, teaching strategies, and activist efforts to diversify the curriculum, the classroom, and the campus.

■ **Twenty-First Century Challenge: Lesbians and Gays in Education Bridging the Gap**, Sue McConnell-Celi, \$17.95. Over thirty lesbian and gay educators present their stories of staying in and coming out in the educational setting. This fascinating anthology includes essays, comic strips, photographs, and fiction. Some contributions are from gay youth in high school.

The tone and content of these books are chilling. But the aim is abundantly clear, and no further commentary is needed.

SAFEGUARDING THE FAMILY

Being queer is more than setting up house, sleeping with a person of the same gender, and seeking state approval for doing so.... Being queer means pushing the parameters of sex, sexuality, and family; and in the process, transforming the very fabric of society.... We must keep our eyes on the goals of providing true alternatives to marriage and of radically reordering society's view of reality.¹

-PAULA L. ETTELBRICK PROFESSOR OF LAW,
BARNARD COLLEGE

SINCE ADAM AND Eve, civilized societies have understood that a family consists of a mother, a father, and their children. But, amazingly, some people want us to believe this sane and logical definition needs updating. People like Paula Ettelbrick, for example, who is executive director of the International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission in New York and an adjunct professor of law at Barnard College, would have us believe that the concept of family is flexible and fluid, that it can shift to accommodate just about any assortment of individuals. Of course she's wrong, and ten thousand years of human history is the best witness against her. But that hasn't stopped radicals like Ettelbrick from tampering with laws of human nature that ought to be sacrosanct.

Unmoved by centuries of biological reality, homosexual activists are only too eager to abandon fundamental social realities in order to promote their agenda. You don't need to be a rocket scientist to understand that it takes two to procreate. That's how the system works. And those two have to be male and female. Feminists have tried to prove that embryos can be created by other means than the traditional way-the mating process and the union of egg and sperm-but all the biomedical gymnastics in the world can't change the fact that human beings and other living things come into existence through reproduction, and tampering with God's pristine design is playing with fire.

But playing with fire is common practice for many in the homosexual movement. Georgi Somers and Sandy Gast are two people who offer a grim picture of what's ahead for the concept of family if the homosexual shape-shifters have their way. Somers and Gast are both male-to-female transsexuals who are still in "transition" Both have male and female sexual

characteristics and believe they should have the "right" to marry each other. Both of them are suffering from a mental problem called a gender identity disorder (GID). However, instead of locating a psychiatrist to help them overcome their unnatural feelings of being members of the opposite sex, they found a surgeon who was willing to mutilate their bodies and transform them into fake females.

In February 2004, Sandy Gast filled out a marriage license request in Leavenworth County, Kansas, on which he indicated that he was a woman. He had a driver's license, social security card, and an amended birth certificate reflecting his new sexual identity. He and Georgi Somers, another transsexual, were planning to wed. Somers' daughter, however, was aghast at what was happening and called Kansas authorities with the news that Somers was actually her father, and not a woman. The marriage documents were illegal, and Sandy Gast was arrested for making false claims on his marriage license application.

Leavenworth County prosecuting attorney Frank Kohl told reporters, "The change of a driver's license, the change of name even though they were done through legal channels, doesn't change gender." Kohl notes: "The gender you're born with is the gender you remain for life." He then cited a 2002 Kansas Supreme Court ruling involving a transsexual who had married a wealthy millionaire named Marshall Gardiner in 1998. When Gardiner died less than a year later, his transsexual "spouse" J'Noel, tried to collect his inheritance as his "wife" But the Kansas Supreme Court ruled that J'Noel couldn't collect the inheritance because under Kansas state law he was a man. And they added, "A post-operative male-to-female transsexual does not fit the common definition of a female."²

EVERYTHING Is BACKWARD

Unfortunately, the same types of confusion that exist within the homosexual community are seeping into the rest of the culture as well. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, by 1998, only 25 percent of American households still fit the "traditional" definition of two parents and their children. From 1994 to 1998, the number of married couple households in the United States increased by 2 percent, while the number of unmarried households increased by 11 percent. So on top of a heartbreaking rise in divorces, with half of all first marriages and nearly two-thirds of all second marriages ending in divorce, we're also seeing a rise in cohabitation, and a marriage rate that lags behind that of any previous era in our history.³

Also according to the U.S. Census Bureau, the number of households made up of unmarried couples today has grown by 800 percent since 1970. Fully 49 percent of women aged thirty to thirty-four say they've lived with a man before marriage.⁴ Many of these people believe that cohabitation improves their chances of a happy and lasting marriage, but that's not the

case. A survey by researchers at Washington State University shows that women who cohabit are more than twice as likely to become victims of domestic violence.⁵ And a separate study from the National Institute of Mental Health reveals that women who cohabit are three times more likely to suffer from depression and anxiety than those who do not cohabit.⁶

Furthermore, UCLA researchers found that the lack of a genuine commitment of marriage interferes with sexual satisfaction. Couples who lived together first and married later reported less satisfaction in their marriage than couples who had not cohabited, according to the National Institute for Healthcare Research. Even more important, a University of Denver study showed that married couples who cohabited before marriage have a substantially higher rate of divorce than those who did not live together first.⁷ What all of these studies reveal is that trendy redefinitions of the God-given principles of family formation simply do not work. And toying with God's creative order in the name of "tolerance" and "diversity" is playing with fire.

Dr. Charles Socarides is the author of more than eighty books and journal articles dealing with the serious medical and sociological consequences of homosexuality. In his book entitled *Homosexuality: A Freedom Too Far*, the distinguished psychoanalyst answers "a thousand questions about causes and cure and the impact of the gay rights movement on American society." One of the problems discussed in those pages is the confusion brought about by the deliberate misuse of terms such as diversity and democracy by the homosexual Left.⁸

Many in departments of science and elsewhere in the universities, he says, have bought into the idea of "diversity at any price." They maintain that diversity brings consensus and unity on complex social issues, when it actually does just the opposite. "Diversity implies division," says Socarides. The sociologists have everything backwards, and "they're turning centuries of civilization on its head, by trying to institutionalize same-sex sex"

Homosexual activists are all for the collapse of the traditional twoparent family, just as they're all for "diversity" and "tolerance;" which, as Charles Socarides points out, are concepts "that will destroy the civilization we built in this nation under the old theory of the melting pot-a theory that didn't deny differences brought to our shores from afar, but opted, wisely, not to put taxpayers' dollars into structures that would emphasize them."⁹

But it's not just taxpayer abuse that ought to trouble us. Our schools and colleges are being taken over by the diversity epidemic, and with it has come an all-out war to enforce homosexual advocacy on students in classrooms and dorm rooms coast-to-coast. According to a report from the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, more than forty-five colleges and universities in this country already offer at least one course on gay and lesbian issues in their departments of literature, history, sociology, and psychology.¹⁰ The City

University of New York, for example, opened its gay and lesbian research center more than a decade ago, in 1991. In 1993, San Francisco State became the country's first four-year university to offer a formal academic program of courses on gay, lesbian, and bisexual culture. And these are only a few examples.

Typical are courses in lesbian literature, sexual identity, and homosexuality on film. Only in such an environment would you find a course such as English 317 at the University of Michigan, "How to Be Gay: Male Homosexuality and Initiation" Or the course "Selected Topics in Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Literature" at the University of Maryland. Predictably, professors in these programs have made the AIDS epidemic, not a cause for alarm or for restoring a sound moral judgment among their students, but precisely the opposite. They have made HIV and AIDS out to be badges of honor. And they blame these diseases not on their own bad choices but on Christians and others who have warned about the deadly consequences of homosexuality.

A PROPHETIC WARNING

The typical university campus today is a front for promoting the gay lifestyle to young men and women. This may come as a surprise to parents who are investing their life savings to educate their children, but it's a fact, and almost nothing is being done to stop it. The goal and aim of the vast majority of faculty members on many of the nation's most prestigious university campuses are no longer to educate and prepare the next generation of young Americans for leadership, but, rather, "to raise gay consciousness" among students-which is just more evidence that higher education in this country has been politicized virtually beyond repair.

What is the agenda on campus? "More propaganda than science;" says Socarides. And those who teach in gay and lesbian studies departments actually believe that homosexuality gives them a special cachet. What a fraud! Homosexuals can be redeemed from same-sex attraction, as I will show in due course, but the idea that the homosexual "deathstyle" is something to be proud of is tragic indeed. And the fact that it's being promoted in the midst of an epidemic that will kill millions before the contagion has run its course is a crime and a curse on our land.

The prophet Isaiah was speaking of people like this when he wrote, "Woe to those who call evil good, and good evil; who put darkness for light, and light for darkness; who put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter!" (Isa. 5:20, NKJv). Everything in the homosexual culture has been turned upside down, and the men and women who fall into this lifestyle, for whatever reasons, are subject to every sort of evil. They are dying of terrible diseases in record numbers, and still they refuse to admit or even recognize what it is that's killing them.

When news of a new AIDS "supervirus" hit the headlines in early 2005, leaders of the homosexual community panicked. A lengthy report in the New York Times said that, "While many are calling for a renewed commitment to prevention effort and free condoms, some veterans of the war on AIDS are advocating an entirely new approach.... They want to track down those who knowingly engage in risky behavior and try to stop them before they can infect others." The author of the book *The Gay Metropolis*, Charles Kaiser, went so far as to say that, "Gay men do not have the right to spread a debilitating and often fatal disease" And he added, "A person who is HIV-positive has no more right to unprotected intercourse than he has the right to put a bullet through another person's head."¹¹

Even homosexual activist Larry Kramer, who has AIDS, felt compelled to confront the homosexual community in a speech at New York's Cooper Union, criticizing gay men for their indiscriminate promiscuous behavior. "You are still murdering each other;" he told them. "Please stop with all the generalizations and avoidance excuses gays have used since the beginning to ditch this responsibility for this fact" The audience heard his words, but was anybody really listening?

No sooner had Kramer's and Kaiser's warnings been publicized by the mainstream media and the homosexual press than many homosexual activist groups began issuing warnings about the dangers of allowing the public health system to police homosexual behaviors. Even in the face of their own death and the potential of a catastrophic pandemic that could eventually reach far beyond the members of their own community, these sexual hedonists refused to limit their excessive behaviors or even to call for rational changes to their erotic behaviors.

This is the crisis of our time. It's the very face of evil. From the college campus to the media centers of New York and Hollywood, people who should know better are buying into an agenda that could destroy us, and they're doing it in a big way. They are not concerned for the safety of others, and they refuse to respect reasonable limits on their behavior. The TV and film industries actively promote homosexuality to our children with no concern for the consequences. Very few young people today understand the risks of the gay lifestyle, but kids in the schools and colleges are being encouraged to become vocal advocates for homosexuals and their lifestyle.

CONSEQUENCES OF CONFUSION

In his research with individuals who have attempted to leave the homosexual lifestyle, Dr. Jeffrey Satinover found that 52 percent of those who entered a program of therapy were able to overcome their attraction for individuals of the same sex.¹² The research team of Masters and Johnson reported more than twenty years ago a 65 percent success rate after a five-year follow-up, and some counselors have reported successful rates of

change as high as 70 percent.¹³ And when faith is a factor in the therapy, these changes are not only lasting but truly miraculous.

The real problem is that too many people think they can play with fire and get away with it. They want to experience the excitement of sexual gratification without following the rules laid down by the Creator. In his book *The Bible and Homosexuality*, Robert Gagnon writes:

The powerful mating instinct built into the human species, with its enormous potential for both pleasure and pain, consumes an extraordinary amount of our time and energy as we attempt to figure out how to satisfy it and domesticate it, with whom and when, so as to maximize pleasure and minimize pain to ourselves and others. The mating instinct can be harnessed to build families, contribute to a stable and maturing society generally, and promote happiness, but it can also destroy those social goods. Consequently, much is at stake on nearly any issue involving sexual ethics.¹⁴

This is no idle warning. Unprincipled and immoral sexual indulgence—whether it's same-sex or male-and-female relationships—is a dangerous and often disastrous enterprise. How many millions of homes have been wrecked by it? How many lives have been destroyed by it? We may never know, but the human cost is enormous, and it's not just the participants who are damaged. Sometimes it's the innocent children who learn by observing what their parents or others are doing who are scarred by it and lured into behaviors for which they're simply not prepared.

Take, for example, a story reported by Joseph Farah on the Internet Web site *WorldNetDaily* about a ring of children in a small town in Pennsylvania, some of them no more than seven years of age, who were caught teaching each other to have sex. The large group of elementary and middle-school children hid their sexual activities from parents and teachers but readily admitted it when confronted by the police. Newberry Township Police Chief Bill Myers, who prepared the charges that would send six of these youngsters to juvenile court, said that the boldness and lack of shame of the children was the most disturbing aspect of the case.

"These kids knew that what they were doing wasn't right;" he said, "but they didn't know it was as bad as it was. There was a naivete about the legal and moral consequences" Charges filed against six of the youths included rape, involuntary deviate sexual intercourse, and indecent assault. "Why didn't these kids know how wrong it is?" asks columnist and author Joseph Farah. "For the same reason most kids in America today don't know. They've never been told—at least not in any authoritative and meaningful way"¹⁵

Thanks to Hollywood, TV, and the lyrics of the rock and rap music that saturates their every waking hour, the main message kids are getting today is

that sex of any kind is always cool. Sex education programs, as I said in the previous chapter, are not about protecting children from harm but luring them into harm's way-as if condoms were the answer for every problem. Our children aren't learning the three Rs anymore, but they are getting the message that sex is fun-so just do it! Kids as young as five and six years old are taught how to put condoms on bananas. There's little left to the imagination in most of the entertainment our children consume. So why are we shocked to discover that they're having wild sex parties after school? These kids have been taught how to do it since kindergarten, and they learned their lessons very well.

Today's most popular TV shows push sex in prime time. Based on the large number of sitcoms that feature openly gay characters, you have to believe that the most favored and most protected type of sexuality is homosexuality. Homosexuals are invariably portrayed as funny, sensitive, and caring individuals. At the same time, critics of homosexuality are portrayed as bigoted and ignorant homophobes who have to learn to accept homosexuality as a valid lifestyle choice. Homosexual screen and television writers have so successfully co-opted the language of civil rights that they have transformed a sin the Bible calls an "abomination" into a protected "civil right"

Programs such as *Will and Grace*, *Queer as Folk*, *Queer Eye for the Straight Guy*, and certain episodes of cartoon features such as *The Simpsons* incorporate homosexual themes and make homosexual characters their heroes. A hit drama on the Showtime network, called *The L Word*, is all about lesbian relationships and the quirky things that happen to a group of lesbian women. These shows are designed to desensitize Americans to the genuine risks of the homosexual agenda. And they often do it by force, to the point that organizations like the Gay & Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation (GLAAD) actually have veto power over many of these scripts and can actually force directors and producers to rewrite dialogue that casts an unflattering light on homosexuals.¹⁶ And we wonder why some of our kids are confused?

OVERHAULING MARRIAGE

In recent years, the battle for same-sex marriage has become the centerpiece of the homosexual agenda. Homosexuals say they want the right to get married and live normal lives just like heterosexual couples, but this is a lie. On the surface, marriage seems like such a natural and innocent request. Who could argue with that? But that's another part of the homosexuals' campaign of deception. What they actually want is to force same-sex marriage on America as part of a much larger strategy for destroying the concept of marriage altogether.

If that sounds extreme, consider the words of one of their own. Writing in

Out! magazine, homosexual activist Michelangelo Signorile makes this aspect of the agenda perfectly clear. In the article he urges his fellow homosexuals to "fight for same-sex marriage and its benefits and then, once granted, redefine the institution of marriage completely.... To debunk a myth and radically alter an archaic institution.... The most subversive action lesbians and gays can undertake-and one that would perhaps benefit all of society-is to transform the notion of 'family' altogether" ¹⁷

There it is: the mission is not participation but subversion. Very much like attorney and activist Paula Ettelbrick, mentioned earlier, Signorile's goal is to bulldoze moral restraint and to invalidate cultural restrictions on sexual hedonism in all its forms. Ultimately, the activists want the freedom to indulge in activities-as expressed by the newest buzzword of the homosexual lifestyle, polyamory, which is group sex-that will destroy any meaningful definition of family. Some, like Signorile, admit now what I've been saying for years: their goal is to abolish all prohibitions against sex with multiple partners. In other words, "Anything goes!"

When the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court issued its edict in November 2003, there was no question that the real aim was legalizing same-sex marriage, not just in that state, but in every state. Because of the implicit dangers of that ruling, there are efforts under way in some quarters to block the court's action and institute Defense of Marriage (DOMA) legislation. But it's unclear what the citizens of Massachusetts, Vermont, California, New Jersey, Connecticut, and other states where this issue has arisen will actually do, or what sort of restrictions they will support.

According to one recent poll, 68 percent of the American people favor preserving marriage as it has been known throughout recorded history-namely, the union of one man and one woman in holy matrimony.¹⁸ But will that huge majority persuade the courts? If marriage is redefined to include same-sex unions, more than likely it will be because a few unprincipled judges, bowing to homosexuals and their supporters, are determined to force their idea of marriage and family on an unwilling nation.

When Congress passed the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA) in 1996, they did so with the support of 68 percent of the American people. The vote in the House was an astonishing 342 to 67, and in the Senate it was an equally impressive 85 to 14. The bill was signed into law by then President Bill Clinton, but he did it in the middle of the night to make sure there was little or no opportunity for the press to report on this important story. That law recognized the traditional definition of marriage as the legal union of one man and one woman. It also insured that no state would be forced to accept another state's definition of marriage if it included either "civil unions" or "same-sex marriage"

Subsequently, forty-three states passed constitutional amendments and ordinances of various kinds to protect the institution of marriage from

redefinition by the homosexual lobby. But now this legislation faces new challenges in Florida, California, and Nebraska. On May 12, 2005, a single federal judge in Omaha, Nebraska, decided that an amendment to the state's constitution banning homosexual marriage was unconstitutional. Despite the fact that the amendment had been passed by an overwhelming 70 percent of Nebraska's voters, judge Joseph Battalione had the audacity to side with the ACLU and overturn the wishes of the electorate.

Judge Battalione's bad decision is just one more sign of things to come if the American people don't rise up and say, "Enough is enough!" Our Founding Fathers designed a system of checks and balances to protect us from such things, and no federal judge should have the authority to overturn the will of the people. But that's where we find ourselves all too often these days.

Since DOMA was signed into law, a long list of academics, activists, and their lawyers have introduced legal challenges claiming the federal and state laws are unconstitutional. But the people of America say otherwise. In poll after poll it's clear that the American people want to preserve the sanctity of marriage. They want to safeguard the family. But unless we are able to convince our representatives in Congress, and in state legislatures nationwide, to fight for our values, decisions like the one in Massachusetts could easily become the pretext for introducing same-sex marriage provisions into the laws of every state.

If same-sex marriage is recognized in state laws, the results will be catastrophic. In his book *Same-Sex Marriage: Putting Every Household at Risk*, Matthew Stayer addressed this very issue:

If same-sex marriage is recognized, then 95 percent of the homosexual agenda will have been achieved. It will be just a matter of time before that agenda infiltrates and undermines every part of the culture, from the classroom to the courtroom, from Congress to city hall, from private affairs to business, from the family to our fundamental freedoms. Certainly there is no constitutional, historical, or logical basis for samesex marriage.¹⁹

Ultimately, the only way that federal and state governments can protect us from this sort of abuse is for Congress to pass a constitutional amendment that declares legal marriage in this country to be only the legal union of one man and one woman. To become law, such an amendment would require a vote of two-thirds of both houses of Congress followed by ratification by three-fourths of the state legislatures-this is the only process that has ever been used successfully in this country. That means we need the votes of 290 members of the House of Representatives and 67 senators to get this measure to the president's desk, where it can be signed into law. It's not easy, but if Christians and others who care about the sanctity of the family rise to the challenge, by contacting their representatives, I believe it

can be done, and also I believe it's the only way to stop the deliberate "overhauling of straight America"

GATEWAY TO GOMORRAH

In his article "Beyond Gay Marriage" in the Weekly Standard, Stanley Kurtz says, "Among the likeliest effects of gay marriage is to take us down a slippery slope to legalized polygamy and 'polyamory' (group marriage). Marriage will be transformed into a variety of relationship contracts, linking two, three, or more individuals (however weakly and temporarily) in every conceivable combination of male and female. A scare scenario? Hardly. The bottom of this slope is visible from where we stand. Advocacy of legalized polygamy is growing."

Marriage, as Kurtz and others have reiterated, is a vital social contract and a foundational building block of society. Not only do families depend on marriage for strength and stability, but also society itself hinges on the preservation and protection of stable two-parent families. "Up to now," writes Kurtz, "with all the changes in marriage, the one thing we've been sure of is that marriage means monogamy." But, he adds, "Gay marriage will break that connection. It will do this by itself, and by leading to polygamy and polyamory. What lies beyond gay marriage is no marriage at all."²⁰

Evidence supporting this important argument could be seen in the controversy that erupted in San Francisco when the newly elected mayor, Gavin Newsom, decided to grant marriage licenses to same-sex couples. When liberal judges and elected officials, first in San Francisco, and then in Vermont, Massachusetts, and Oregon, began flouting the law, issuing marriage licenses to homosexuals, Newsom decided it was his turn to set the pace of moral deregulation. But in the process, he violated the laws of California and the United States and provoked a very public battle that is still raging.

On March 11, 2004, the California Supreme Court ruled that Newsom's activities were illegal, and they called a halt to the granting of licenses. It was a victory for conservatives in that state. In the meantime, a circuit court of appeals for the state of Oregon granted a motion to stop the issuance of marriage licenses to homosexuals in that state as well. Polls continue to show that a solid majority of Americans oppose the idea of homosexual marriage, but some of them say that "civil unions" are OK. But this is an important lesson for all Americans. Homosexual marriage and "civil unions" are effectively the same thing, because they are in fact the legitimization of an immoral sexual union that undermines the entire social order.

After the 2004 elections, Newsom was blamed by politicians on the Left for helping to provoke the conservative backlash at the polls, when voters in eleven states during the November election and three others in their state

primaries overwhelmingly rejected legalization of gay marriage and unseated liberal office-holders who had supported same-sex marriages. Leaders of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, among them, pointed to the fact that seventeen states were in the process of passing legislation to ensure that marriage remains a right reserved for heterosexual couples. And to top it off, many of those states had also passed bans on "civil unions."²¹

Mayor Newsom may have been reprimanded by the Court and by some of his friends, but he was unapologetic, and he made it clear he was not dissuaded from his agenda. On February 12, 2005, Newsom threw a big party for three thousand homosexuals on the steps of San Francisco's city hall, apparently to mock the law and the citizens of California. In recognizing all those who had received bogus marriage licenses in that city, Newsom proved that he was undeterred by any setback. And he said in his address to the crowd that, "This door is open, and nothing the president of the United States can do will ever shut this door."²²

But not everybody was buying the mayor's rhetoric. Ben Lopez, who is one of our bright young lobbyists at the Traditional Values Coalition, responded to Newsom's tirade, saying, "You have three thousand people converging that are very misguided, three thousand people that fail to take up for the truth and fail to learn from the election we had in November. They are on the losing side of the issue."²³ Ben's comments, quoted in a news account from the Associated Press, made it perfectly clear (as the AP's own headline suggested) that, "The people of California are on our side, and they are the silent majority."

MAKING FALSE CLAIMS

Whether you call it "same-sex marriage" or "civil unions," any attempt to legalize and legitimize homosexual unions is a giant step down a very slippery slope. On the surface, such things may appear to be innocent and unimportant. After all, we're fair-minded people, and it only seems natural to give homosexuals some kind of clarity in their relationships with their homosexual partners. But this is a false argument, and deliberately misleading.

The fact is, all fifty states in this country have laws concerning "power of attorney," and with a "power of attorney" document homosexuals don't need some other title, such as "civil unions;" to legitimize their relationship. If two men or two women want to leave their estate to each other or to give some kind of legal rights to another person concerning their health care, then they already have the right to do that through "power of attorney." The state gives any person so authorized the right to act on behalf of another person, especially when that person may not be capable or competent to act on their own behalf.

"Civil marriage" is another term that is often confused with civil unions. Many people have been married by a civil union, which is to say that a justice of the peace, a judge, or some other sworn official has performed a legal marriage ceremony. They've had a civil marriage, as opposed to a church marriage with a minister present. But we shouldn't be confused by the term, because civil marriages, which are legal, have nothing to do with civil unions, which are not. Civil unions are men or women of the same sex asking for the same benefits that husbands and wives get when their legal marriage license is recorded by the local government official.

Civil unions are very definitely a slippery slope. We don't want government to create civil unions because it only multiplies the confusion for the courts. And that's why we need a constitutional amendment that prohibits not only marriage between people of the same sex but also any other sexual arrangement receiving the same benefits granted by the state to a husband and wife in a lawful marriage.

When we talk about these issues, we really need to understand what the Bible has to say about the sin of sexual promiscuity. There are some things that are so harmful and dangerous by their very nature that we need to be warned about them from our earliest years. A hot stove, for example, can be a dangerous thing, and children have to be taught from infancy not to touch a stove or they may burn their hands. It's the same way with morality. Morality is clearly defined for us by the Bible, and we need to teach our children what God's Word has to say about the dangers of sexual sin.

If we choose not to obey God, and if we refuse to heed the warnings of the Word of God, then we put ourselves and our families at great personal risk. We do harm not only to ourselves, but we endanger those around us as well. If we despise the warnings of Scripture and fail to obey God's laws concerning sexual morality, we're like children who willfully ignore their parent's instructions and, to our own sorrow and great pain, grab hold of a hot stove.

Whenever I talk about promiscuity, I notice that people perk up. When I talk about fornication, adultery, or sexual hedonism-which is pornography and obscenity-they realize that those are real things. But I sometimes wonder, Do they really hear those warnings? In the average church today, young teenagers are allowed to wear clothing that exposes way too much bare flesh. I've seen young women who obviously have never been taught the most basic rules of personal modesty, and they show up on Sunday with half their bodies exposed.

Naturally, this only stimulates the young men in the congregation, and that's not the purpose of church. When you go to a beach, you'll see people of all shapes and sizes, large and small, in their bathing suits, and that's no big deal because that's the environment for it. But in church your mind is supposed to be on the things of God, and if people show up looking like they're ready for the beach, it's distracting and inappropriate. This is one

reason why orthodox Jews put the men on one side of the synagogue and women on the other, so that both of them can concentrate on the things of God and not on one another.

AMENDING THE CONSTITUTION

The disorders associated with homosexuality are complicated and disturbing, and they wreak havoc on the natural order. The sex acts in which homosexuals engage open them up to unbelievable health risks. The difference between natural intercourse and unnatural anal intercourse is an enormous and deadly difference. Most people are uncomfortable talking about such things, but even though such talk is repellant to most audiences, it's essential that we speak openly and honestly about them. We are not used to this kind of talk, but avoiding the issue only allows the dangers of the homosexual lifestyle to masquerade under a cloak of silence, and we can see the consequence of that in AIDS wards and hospices all over America, as well as in the terrifying statistics of homosexual mortality. So honesty is needed in all these areas.

In order to deal openly and honestly with the risks of the homosexual agenda, the Traditional Values Coalition has joined with a group of legislators, family policy organizations, and Christian activists to help promote a new constitutional amendment to protect the sanctity of marriage-with no civil unions. In fact, the genius of this new proposal is that it actually contains two amendments, to be considered simultaneously, that provide extra guarantees for traditional marriage.

Amendment XXVIII says, "Marriage in the United States shall consist only of the union of a man and a woman." The second, Amendment XXIX, says, "Neither the United States nor any state shall recognize or grant to any unmarried person, or to a union other than a marriage of one man and one woman, the legal right of status of a married spouse" That means no "civil unions" The issues must be voted on by Congress. When they are passed by both houses, they will be sent to the states, where they will be considered by the voters, and, when approved by three-fourths of the states, eventually added to the Constitution itself.

These amendments were actually drafted in strict accordance with the policies prescribed by the Constitution. When the first ten amendments to the Constitution were sent to the states in 1791, the state conventions were asked to consider twelve amendments at the same time. So there's precedent for sending more than one amendment at a time for the states to consider.

When amendments are voted on by the states, it's not a constitutional convention at the state level; rather, it's a ratification convention. What this means is that politicians at the state and local level cannot alter the language of the proposed amendments; they can only ratify or not ratify,

with "Yea" or "Nay," these two amendments. The people of each state have a vote, not just the legislature, and that's the principal difference between this initiative and others that were put forward in the twentieth century.

No one believes the amendments can be passed without a fight. Chris Crain, who is the executive editor of the Washington Blade homosexual newspaper, says homosexual activists must fight for legalization of same-sex marriage as a means of gaining passage of what they really want, which is federal antidiscrimination laws giving them federal protections for their lifestyle. In other words, homosexuals want to wage war on any attempt to protect traditional marriage because they want to force homosexuality on the rest of us. What they're after are more hate crimes and antidiscrimination laws to punish those who refuse to acknowledge and endorse the homosexual agenda.

In that publication, Crain said, "Any leader of any gay rights organization who is not prepared to throw the bulk of their efforts right now into the fight for marriage is squandering resources and doesn't deserve the position."²⁴ Evan Wolfson, who is director of a homosexual group called Freedom to Marry, has said, "Isn't having the law pretend that there is only one family model that works (let alone exists) a lie? ... Marriage is not just about procreation-indeed is not necessarily about procreation at all."²⁵

Clearly, creating a family unit that contributes to the good of society has nothing to do with what homosexuals really want. Mitchel Raphael, editor of the Canadian homosexual magazine Fab, admits, "Ambiguity is a good word for the feeling among gays about marriage. I'd be for marriage if I thought gay people would challenge and change the institution and not buy into the traditional meaning of 'till death do us part' and monogamy forever. We should be Oscar Wildes and not like everyone else watching the play."²⁶ All of which means that those of us who do care about preserving traditional marriage must be prepared to defend it with a similar voracity.

THE VOICE OF THE PEOPLE

How can anyone reading the crass and calculated comments of homosexual activists like those cited above be expected to show respect for their agenda? The homosexual lifestyle is, at the very least, vulgar and repugnant. The only way Americans have been persuaded to tolerate homosexuals in their midst is because of the mantra, "What they do behind closed doors is nobody's business" The minute homosexuals come out from behind those closed doors and begin to invade the public square with their vile behaviors, tolerance and acceptance fade quickly. The last thing homosexuals want is for middle America to be reminded what the homosexual community is actually doing. There's nothing "civil" or "right" about it.

As columnist Kelly Boggs points out in one recent editorial, "Images evoke

emotions that in turn enable a viewer to identify with, or reject, a product, person, or idea."²⁷ Positive images, as every advertiser knows, attract attention and gain support. Negative images, however, repel and lead to disapproval. Politicians have certainly learned this lesson. But ever since Gavin Newsom and his ilk on the East and West Coasts began pandering to the homosexual right to "same-sex marriage," most of the images the world has seen of homosexual couples pledging their love for one another have been anything but attractive. If anything, these photos remind us why homosexual marriage is a bad idea.

The mainstream media is supportive of "homosexual rights" and "gay marriage," and television networks and periodicals have gone to great lengths to portray homosexuality in a positive light. But despite all this journalistic advocacy, consumer polls continue to show that a majority of Americans-in some surveys as high as 70 percent-are opposed to the idea of homosexual marriage. Even in states where marriage licenses have been issued, including Massachusetts, California, Oregon, New Mexico, New York, and Illinois, the citizens are overwhelmingly against gay marriage.

As Kelly Boggs says, "The daily parade of grooms kissing grooms and brides embracing brides might well be too much for grassroots Americans to handle."²⁸ And I believe that's the case. Americans tend to be "open minded" about the choices other people make. We don't always want to be our brother's moral keeper, and the trend of political correctness has persuaded too many, perhaps, that those in the moral majority have no right to correct others who defy social norms. We're willing to "live and let live," up to a point. But it may well be that, with homosexuality being thrust into our faces almost every day, a lot of people are ready to rebel.

Evidence of this sort of backlash could be seen in the results of the 2004 general election, in which "values voters" spoke with a resounding and unified voice. According to exit polls, white religious conservatives-who represented approximately 17 percent of the electorate in 1996 and just 14 percent in 2000-accounted for more than 23 percent of all voters in the 2004 election. Fully 78 percent of those people voted for George W. Bush and the Republican ticket. And of particular note, Catholic voters supported Bush over his Catholic opponent, John Kerry, by a margin of 52 to 47 percent.²⁹ That's a new and important trend.

In the South, once a Democrat stronghold, voters told pollsters they were concerned about the assault on marriage coming from the homosexual community. Southerners believe in strong families, strong community bonds, and laws that protect them from liberal politicians who want to run their lives from Washington. These people said they wanted to protect their children from indoctrination in the schools and sex education curricula that expose kids to even greater risks. They were against the collapse of sexual mores and the liberal policies of the National Education Association supporting condom distribution and easy access to abortion. They want

"parental notification" laws enacted, and they want left-wing politics taken out of the classrooms and out of their lives.

Because they believed that George W. Bush speaks their language, and because he's a man of strong religious convictions, these values voters gave the president 51 percent of their votes nationwide, and fully 58 percent in the South. Republican candidates won all five open Senate seats in the South, as well as those in Oklahoma and South Dakota-for a net gain of four seats in the Senate. And one of their own told the Democrats why it happened. When he rose to challenge the direction of his party, Senator Zell Miller spoke for the nation. The liberal agenda of Democrats today, he said, is out of touch with most Americans.

In his best-selling book, *A National Party No More: The Conscience of a Conservative Democrat*, Senator Miller made it clear that homosexuals and other special interest groups have virtually destroyed his party and doomed them to obscurity. And that was a major part of their revolt in November 2004.

What values voters have told America is that they still care deeply about preserving marriage and safeguarding the family. They care about protecting their children from violent and vulgar entertainment, and they want to make sure that their children are taught the same values in the schoolroom that they are being taught at home. Values voters believe in the moral standards that made America great, and they believe that homosexuality has no place in that worldview. If more Americans would wake up to that reality, I believe we would see a renewal of culture, a renewal of society, and an explosion of faith which is something for which I've been praying for many years.

AWAKENING THE CHURCH

The way out of this mess is not going to be easy. Sleeping is easy; vigilance has a price. Fundamentally, if the Church is not to be caught asleep again, we have to prioritize our activities, and devote more resources to both education and activism in the defense of life. This work cannot be a hobby; it will require us to give everything. But that should sound familiar to Christians.

-FATHER FRANK PAVONE PRIESTS FOR LIFE

I CAN'T REMEMBER A time in my life when the church has been under such intense pressure from the surrounding culture. We're being threatened by the courts, the media, the schools and colleges, the cultural elites, and even by schisms and divisions within the church itself. We are witnessing a collapse of public morality and signs of widespread disrespect for the gospel and the message of redemption. Historically, the church has always grown stronger in adversity, and the great strength of the body of Christ has been its ability to endure persecution. By returning to our roots, the church has been able to expand its ministry and transform the lives of people in all walks of life. But are we still able to do that? Do we still believe in the power of renewal? As we enter this new millennium with controversies raging all around us, do Christians still have the capacity to be salt and light to this hurting world?

On March 2, 2005, the Supreme Court of the United States ruled that a sentence of capital punishment may not be administered by any court to criminal defendants under the age of eighteen. Regardless of the circumstances and regardless of the degree of premeditation, prior arrests, or the brutality of the offense in question, five justices, who consulted foreign laws and unratified international treaties for justification for their ruling, made law from the bench that ignores the United States Constitution and the statutes of every state where the death penalty has been declared a valid option for capital crimes committed by juveniles.¹

On the same day the Supreme Court began hearing arguments to determine whether or not the Ten Commandments may be displayed on public property. The point of contention was a six-foot granite monument that has stood on the grounds of the Texas State Capitol since 1961, along with two others from a Kentucky courthouse.² Verdicts of the lower courts were divided on the issue, so the Supreme Court decided to take the case

that was brought to them on appeal by the ACLU. The last time the Court considered a comparable case was *Stone v. Graham*, in 1980, when five justices struck down Kentucky's law allowing the Ten Commandments to be displayed in public school classrooms.

The Bush administration asked the Court to decide in favor of allowing the citizens of these states to decide such issues for themselves, while on the other side, the American Civil Liberties Union has gathered the usual suspects to join them in calling for removal. So where does this leave us? Does the White House have a prayer of standing up to the mighty ACLU? Will the church rise and let her voice be heard? Will the American people rise to the occasion in defense of their constitutionally guaranteed freedoms? I may as well ask if the sun will rise tomorrow in the West. We've been here too many times before, and the ACLU knows it.

The fact is, the American people resoundingly support the idea of displaying the Ten Commandments in public places, whether it's in courthouses, schoolrooms, or public parks. Polls have shown for decades that while the people believe in a separation of church and state in general terms, they have no problem with honoring our nation's religious heritage or acknowledging the biblical basis of our Constitution and our laws.

But if this is true, why do we find ourselves constantly fighting groups like the ACLU in courtrooms all across America? And why do we find ourselves losing these battles time after time? The annual Gallup Poll of religion in America has shown conclusively for more than forty years that upwards of 85 percent of Americans identify themselves as Christians. So what difference does it make? If this is true, and Christians make up a solid majority in every poll, then why is it the ungodly who seem to make all the rules?

IF THE FOUNDATIONS ARE DESTROYED

George Gallup Jr. and Timothy Jones wrote a book a few years ago about the state of religion in America called *The Next American Spirituality: Finding God in the Twenty-first Century*. Drawing on the findings of the Gallup organization's exhaustive research on this issue over many years, the authors pointed to the growing emphasis on spirituality in modern culture, but they warned that, both inside and outside the Christian community, the level of spirituality is shallow and lacks healthy roots. In one pointed observation they say, "Americans face constant temptations to pass over the wisdom of the ancients in favor of the guru of the month"³

During much of the twentieth century, these authors tell us, most Americans practiced their faith in a traditional Judeo-Christian framework. Most, in fact, remained in the religious traditions they had grown up with and were comfortable with that. Today, however, the institutional church is

much less important, and young people in particular are much more likely to seek spiritual guidance from self-help books or the Oprah Winfrey Show than to consult a pastor or Bible teacher. Books ranging from New Age favorites like *Embraced by the Light* and *The Celestine Prophecy* show up on the same shelves with Christian titles such as *The Prayer of Jabez*, the *Left Behind* series, and *The Purpose-Driven Life*. They shoot to the top of the bestseller lists, but many readers can't tell the difference between them. It's all about spirituality.

The flurry of interest in angels in the nineties is a good example. Angels are certainly a biblical topic, but many people who followed that fad were just as excited about tarot cards, horoscopes, and the occult. The level of spiritual discernment is shockingly low in today's culture, and the consequence is that a lot of people are poorly equipped to deal with the complexities of modern life. So where do we lay the blame for this situation?

Dr. D. A. Carson, a professor of theology in Deerfield, Illinois, has written an important book called *The Gagging of God*, which analyzes the impact of pluralism and moral relativism on contemporary culture. In particular, he looks at the way postmodernism, deconstructionism, and other trends in philosophy have affected the church over the last forty years. In the book, Carson points out that, "In many parts of the country, we cannot assume any biblical knowledge on the part of our hearers at all: the most elementary Bible stories are completely unknown. Furthermore, the situation is getting worse!"⁴

We know it's true, but is this the fault of the National Education Association? Should we blame the ACLU or the Supreme Court? Or should we, instead, be looking in the mirror? A recent survey by the Barna Research Group suggests that the trend for the foreseeable future is that the popular culture will have much greater influence on American society than the Christian church. The name Jesus Christ means little to many young people today, and evangelical Christianity no longer ranks among the top ten "change agents" in our society. The reason for this state of affairs, according to Barna's report, is not just the attack from outside the church but the ignorance on the inside. This situation is due in large part to a shameful lack of spiritual understanding and biblical knowledge and a failure to faithfully apply the biblical command to engage the culture.

Even if such charges are exaggerated, most of us would have to admit that there's an element of truth to them. Our churches have grown large and comfortable. We have programs. We have expansion plans. We have baseball tournaments and potluck suppers. We have gifted teachers and speakers, tapes and television, and full-color brochures that sparkle in the racks at the door. But what about the men and women who fill the pews? Do they understand Christ's command to work before the night comes when no one can work? Are they concerned about the eradication of our godly heritage by

the schools and the courts? Do they understand what's happening to their children and the world they inhabit? Or are they, perhaps, too busy to notice?

The Holy Spirit is willing for us to respond and overcome evil with good, but too often the flesh is weak. And too many of us simply fail to respond to the challenges that are right there before us. I admit that there are issues to which I'd rather not respond. It can be intimidating to get involved in some of them when there's so much hostility and resentment. But I also know that unless I stand for what I perceive to be God's purpose and His plan, then I can only blame myself when bad things happen.

This is true particularly with the issue of homosexuality, where virtually the entire secular culture is waging war against the Christian resistance. As we have seen over and over in these pages, the agenda of the homosexual lobby is based on the idea that the best way to silence their critics is to respond immediately, loudly, and passionately in order to terrorize and demoralize the opposition. It's a tactic straight out of Adolf Hitler's own playbook, and it works. But knowing what we know now, will we give in to those tactics when so much is at stake?

As we saw in the Supreme Court's verdict in *Roper v. Simmons* (cited earlier), we can count on unjust judges to continue waging war against moral accountability. We can count on those who defend freedom of speech for pornographers and atheists to continue their attacks on our constitutionally guaranteed freedom of religion. But there's a large and powerful consensus among the values voters that things have gone too far. We are at a watershed moment, and if enough of us will rise to defend our historic God-given beliefs and values, miracles can happen.

If those who know the truth will rise to the occasion, nothing can stop us. I will even go so far as to say that on many of the most critical issues, our victory is assured if the church will make up her mind to engage the enemy within our culture and begin to work for what we know to be right. One way is to pass legislation in favor of a constitutional amendment affirming marriage to be the legal union of one man and one woman-with no civil unions-we need just 290 of 435 members of the House of Representatives and 67 senators to vote our way. This can be done with a hard-nosed lobbying effort supported by the active involvement and faithful prayers of God's people. But this means that believers will have to be willing to step up to the plate, to dedicate time, energy, and money to this vital issue. But I have to ask: Are you willing to do that? And will you do it?

UNDOING AN ACT OF DECEPTION

Educating the church is important, of course. Most people don't really like to deal with these issues, and homosexuals have made this issue especially

unpleasant. But we have to become comfortable talking about these things. Because when enough of us stand up and shout, and when we simply refuse to compromise on matters of life and death, our battles can be won.

In his important book *The Naked Public Square*, Richard John Neuhaus shows how the marginalization of religious faith in government and public affairs has created social, political, and moral problems for American culture. With examples from the media and academic circles, Neuhaus argues that the efforts to ban every expression of religious faith from public view has led not only to a "naked public square" but also to overreaching by government and other secular institutions as they seek to fill the ethical void left by the absence of religion and moral values. Neuhaus writes that "the idea is widely accepted that religion is something between an individual and his God," and many Americans have been convinced that "religion is the business of church and home and has no place in public space" But this is fundamentally untrue and far from the principles of republican self-government prescribed by the Constitution.

Furthermore, Neuhaus predicted that there would be further declines in American democracy if citizens fail to recognize what we've lost and take steps to restore the civilizing effects of religion upon society. We have a Christian duty to be engaged in the controversy of ideas, and any further privatization of religion in the public square can only do greater harm to the culture.⁵

In 1954, then Senator Lyndon Johnson pushed a bad bill through the Congress in order to prevent Christian groups from speaking freely on moral and political issues-including, especially, the endorsement of political candidates. Prior to 1954 pastors and churches had the right to speak openly about such things, without fear of losing their tax-exempt status. But for personal, and I believe deeply immoral, reasons, the law was changed to punish Christians who had questioned the legitimacy of Lyndon Johnson's senatorial campaign that year.

The IRS prohibition was invented by Johnson as a way of taking revenge on two nonprofit groups in his home state of Texas who had lobbied against his reelection. The history of that shameful act is part of the public record now, and it's certainly well known to those who have followed Johnson's corrupt rise to power. The book *A Texan Looks at Lyndon: A Study in Illegitimate Power*, by J. Evetts Haley, examines the former senator's ethics and the questionable tactics he used in winning his bid for the Senate in 1948. The Traditional Values Coalition has been working on legislation for several years to attempt to right that historic wrong by restoring free speech to pastors and allowing church leaders, who have every right to discuss the moral content of our laws, to speak freely about positions of local, state, and federal candidates on these moral issues.

This legislation we are calling the Bright Line Bill. It would repeal fully and completely the language Lyndon Johnson drafted in 1954. In its place we

want to say that, yes, churches may be involved in political activity as long as it does not exceed a certain amount. That would be interpreted as 20 percent of their gross income, facilities, programs, staff time, and the like. Why shouldn't a pastor be allowed to speak about issues of local or national concern? Why shouldn't church members be allowed to have a bulletin board that says we support this or that candidate for public office, or that this or that issue concerns us? They might say, we feel strongly about this issue, and here's some reading materials for you to prayerfully consider. The public affairs committee of the church could post photos and biographical information about the candidates, or acknowledge their representatives in city government, the state legislature, or the United States Congress. That's all we're asking for.

STANDING ON PRINCIPLE

The biblical basis for the church exercising her moral authority in a secular government has been well founded since pre-Revolutionary times in this country. As early as the 1600s we had documents such as the Fundamental Orders of Connecticut, which was a constitution drafted by Thomas Hooker and Roger Ludlow, that made it perfectly clear that the Word of God would prevail in public policy. The document begins with these words:

For as much as it hath pleased Almighty God by the wise disposition of his divine providence so to order and dispose of things that we the Inhabitants and Residents of Windsor, Hartford, and Wethersfield are now cohabiting and dwelling in and upon the River of Connectecotte and the lands thereunto adjoining; and well knowing where a people are gathered together the word of God requires that to maintain the peace and union of such a people there should bean orderly and decent Government established according to God, to order and dispose of the affairs of the people at all seasons as occasion shall require; do therefore associate and conjoin ourselves to be as one Public State or Commonwealth; and do for ourselves and our successors and such as shall be adjoined to us at any time hereafter, enter into Combination and Confederation together, to maintain and preserve the liberty and purity of the Gospel of our Lord Jesus which we now profess, as also, the discipline of the Churches, which according to the truth of the said Gospel is now practiced amongst us; as also in our civil affairs to be guided and governed according to such Laws, Rules, Orders and Decrees as shall be made, ordered, and decreed as followeth:⁶

-EMPHASIS ADDED

And the document goes on from there. Deeply pious, profoundly serious, but absolutely certain that maintaining an orderly civil society could only be

accomplished by governing with the will and providence of God. What does this say about the Ten Commandments? Does anyone believe these men and women would have thought that ancient law to be an "unlawful establishment of religion"?

Stop and consider what these men and women had encountered in their voyage to the New World. They had left their homes in Europe and given up everything they had ever known. They crossed a wide and hostile sea in tiny wooden ships. Then, when the Pilgrims arrived within sight of land in 1620, they were blown completely off course by as much as five hundred miles. They were supposed to land in Northern Virginia, but they ended up in Massachusetts Bay instead. The king had granted them rights to land in Virginia, so when they realized they didn't have a clear charter to the territory of Massachusetts Bay, they assembled on board ship and composed the document we know today as the Mayflower Compact, which says:

In the name of God, Amen. We, whose names are underwritten, the Loyal Subjects of our dread Sovereign Lord, King James, by the Grace of God, of England, France and Ireland, King, Defender of the Faith, e&

Having undertaken for the Glory of God, and Advancement of the Christian Faith, and the Honour of our King and Country, a voyage to plant the first colony in the northern parts of Virginia; do by these presents, solemnly and mutually in the Presence of God and one of another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil Body Politick....

And they concluded that historic covenant with the words:

In Witness whereof we have hereunto subscribed our names at Cape Cod the eleventh of November, in the Reign of our Sovereign Lord, King James of England, France and Ireland, the eighteenth, and of Scotland the fifty-fourth. Anno Domini, 1620.⁷

It was an elegant statement of purpose and a clear effort to reach a mutual and legal accord. But, by all means, don't miss what they ultimately accomplished with those words. In the document the Pilgrim Fathers say four key things that are now part of our Christian heritage:

1. "In the name of God, Amen" That's the first thing they said.
2. We have traveled to these shores for the glory of God.
3. We have come to these shores to spread the gospel of Jesus Christ.
4. We covenant and combine ourselves together into a "civil Body Politick"⁸

And the reason for these things was "for our better Ordering and Preservation, and Furtherance of the Ends aforesaid" In other words, the citizens of Massachusetts Bay were the legal authority of the land. They were also the church; the church was the law and the Bible was their text. There were one hundred two passengers on the Mayflower, including the forty-one Puritans who signed that historic document. Each man had a voice and a vote, and clearly they intended for this to be the method of administering the law and the business of their community.

For these men and women, the body of believers was the true and obvious body politic. They had made a covenant with God. Were there non-Christians on that boat? Yes, there were sailors, of course, and a few others. But the Mayflower Compact became a model for the government of New England, and the truth that cries out to us today is that there was no separation of church and state. Every governor who took office in the colonies was inaugurated with an election sermon. He swore to uphold his duty by placing his right hand on the Bible and taking the oath of office before Almighty God.

A LEGACY OF DECEIT

The tradition of swearing on the Bible continues to this day. There are so many places where we see the natural relationship of God and government. But, of course, all of this is contrary to the aims of atheists, civil libertarians, and especially promoters of the homosexual agenda. That's why, when pinned against the wall by an immoral agenda in the 2004 election, the 22 percent of voters identified now as "values voters" rose up to express their views in no uncertain terms. So now when we see people around the world turning the other way-such as those in New Zealand, which announced recently that they are going to pass a civil unions measure-it's clear that we must be firm and decisive in the face of strong opposition.

If the homosexual agenda were ever carried out fully, it would utterly destroy the dynamic creative plan of God. And along with it, it would destroy the whole basis of redemption, because salvation requires repentance and forgiveness. If evil is called good, and if there is no confession of sin, then there can be no remission of sins. When I considered these things it made me think: If the Antichrist were looking for a vehicle to serve as his primary weapon against God's power and dominion in this world, what better weapon could he find? The homosexual agenda would be the perfect vehicle for the Antichrist. First, he would take advantage of the slothfulness of the church. Second, he would benefit by the widespread doctrine of political correctness that has swept into the schools, the courts, the world of business, and many other places in our society. Look at what has happened to the moral framework of American culture in just the last quarter century!

In 2 Thessalonians 2 we read about a restraining force that resists the power of evil in the world. We have the assurance that as long as that restraining force is active, evil will subside. But if the restraint becomes passive, evil will ultimately dominate. How much clearer could it be? We know who's restraining and what has to be done. The Holy Spirit is calling us to take a stand as Christ's agents on this earth; that's our solemn duty. So who stands against the threats of great evil from the antiChristian system? The church. In other words, if you and I, as followers of Jesus Christ, fail to take a stand and resist the forces of darkness in this world, our sloth and ineptitude will be our undoing.

I'm certain that words like these will sound rash or extreme to some readers. I know they sound outrageous to our enemies who will read them as well. But let's take stock for a moment. Are there forces in the world that long to eradicate our legacy of faith? Are there people who would be glad to do away with documents such as the Fundamental Orders of Connecticut, the Mayflower Compact, the Northwest Ordinance, and others that proclaim the deeply held religious beliefs of the Founding Fathers, and insist that this was never a Christian nation? You know the answer.

In an article entitled "America's Communist Lawyer's Union," author and columnist Jack Kinsella recently took a critical look at the ACLU's tactics and the battles they've won in recent years. Under the guise of "protecting American civil rights;" he said, the ACLU has sued to:

- Halt the singing of Christmas carols in public facilities
- Deny tax-exempt status for churches
- Get rid of all military chaplains
- Remove all Christian symbols from public property
- Prohibit Bible reading in classrooms even during free time
- Remove the words "In God We Trust" from our coins
- Remove the words "under God" from the Pledge of Allegiance
- Deny federal funding for Boy Scouts until they admit gays and atheists as leaders⁹

The ACLU is clearly the most powerful advocate for the homosexual agenda and was also the principal supporter of the Supreme Court's horrendous Roe v. Wade decision in 1973. Four years later, the ACLU launched a "Reproductive Freedom Project," promoting unrestricted abortion on demand with funding of more than \$2 million. In 1986 the ACLU began its "Lesbian and Gay Rights Project;" part of which was defending the right of homosexual AIDS patients to keep their disease secret,

meaning that not only their sexual partners but also medical professionals would be kept in the dark and needlessly exposed to the deadly disease.

In May 2000, Arizona Governor Jane Hull issued a proclamation celebrating the birth of Buddha with public support from the ACLU. Two years earlier, however, when Governor Hull issued a proclamation declaring Bible Week in that state, the ACLU sued, because, as they said at the time, it was a violation of the separation of church and state.¹⁰ So much for consistency, and so much for deceit. But, finally, it shouldn't go unnoticed that in 1981, then President Jimmy Carter awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom to ACLU founder Roger Baldwin, referring to the atheist and former Communist organizer as "a champion of human and civil rights"

AMERICA'S WAKE-UP CALL

No one would ever say that victory in such a war will ever come easy, but I can say that the victory will never be won until the church awakes from her slumber and becomes the visible expression of Jesus Christ, raised from the dead in the power of the Holy Spirit, in this fallen world. The homosexual agenda will never be defeated by mere laws. Such people are lawless. Furthermore, the plan to indoctrinate and violate America's children will never be stopped by adopting the "live and let live" strategy of the spiritually deceived pacifists in our midst. This war will only be won by taking the battle to the enemy and taking back the territory we've lost. How do I know this? Let me give you one good example.

Delegate Don Dwyer is a legislator in the state of Maryland who became acquainted with my work and the mission of the Traditional Values Coalition through our video *Gay Rights, Special Rights*. He told me when we met in Washington for the first time that homosexuality was not an issue he wanted to engage. It wasn't a comfortable issue for him, and it was so highly charged politically that he would rather let someone else fight the battle. But having seen the film and understanding what it meant, his conscience wouldn't allow him to turn away.

Because of the importance of this issue, and because of what Delegate Dwyer discovered and then went on to accomplish, I would like to relate in some length his words from a recent interview. I can think of no better example of what I would like to say to you in this chapter to illustrate the importance of waking the church to its mission of renewal.

I asked him how he became interested in this work, and he told me: "A pastor handed me a copy of the film *Gay Rights, Special Rights* and asked if I'd seen it, and I said I hadn't. I knew of the Traditional Values Coalition, and I knew that you were one of the strong leaders in the battle to stop the homosexual movement. But I didn't know much more than that. So I watched the film, and I had the reaction that I think a lot of people must

have. I realized I didn't understand the agenda. I never understood until that moment what was going on. But that tape, in just thirty-eight minutes, showed me how severe the problem really is, and for the first time I understood that the homosexual agenda is directed at our children.

"That was a wake-up call for me," he told me. "But then I realized I had to do something about what I had learned, and I realized I had to take that film and show it to pastors, church leaders, and men and women with influence all over my state as quickly as I could in order to wake the sleeping giant in this country. To wake up the church is to wake a sleeping giant, and that was my goal.

"Because of my position as a legislator in the state of Maryland," he said, "I felt I could probably get people to listen. And over the last several months I've seen that happen. I would say, conservatively, that from five hundred to seven hundred pastors have now seen the film and have heard me speak about the issue of homosexuality in our state. My view is that the issue of same-sex marriage is antithetical to our American view of law and government. I believe as our Founding Fathers did, first of all, that there is a Creator God. Our rights come from Him, and the purpose of government is to protect and defend those God-given rights.

"I have been all around the state talking about these things," the delegate said. "The format is that I show the film and then, immediately afterward, I address church leaders, pastors, deacons, and others and express my deep sorrow that for the last forty years the church has remained silent on issues that we've been led to believe are political in nature, but which we know are really the essence of what the church is required by God to confront.

"In my talks," he said, "I hit hard on what has happened to this country since prayer and Bible reading were removed from the schools. That was a national tragedy, and for the most part the church was silent. Many people wrung their hands and prayed. They wondered how it could have happened in America, but it was too late. The Court had already ruled, and by the time the church decided to say something, it was all over. Then, ten years later, Christians sat home when the Supreme Court, mere men, declared that murder was no longer murder. We now have the innocent blood of millions upon millions of innocent unborn children on our hands."

WHO'S TO BLAME?

Because of the urgency of the issue, Delegate Dwyer told me, he has had to be very direct and sometimes confrontational in his approach. "I have been condemning the church and its leaders, expressing my outrage that they have been deceived into silence on these moral issues, believing the lie that these are political issues and therefore the church has no right to engage in them. In essence, the church has been deceived into silence. But today-now

that we can all see how far the agenda has gone-things are beginning to change.

"I believe I've been witnessing a modern-day miracle;" he told me, "as I've been bringing together pastors from all denominations, all ethnic and racial backgrounds, and from all parts of the state. Protestant, Catholic, black, white, Hispanic, Korean, Chinese, all of us coming together under the same roof because of our concern for our children and grandchildren. We know now what's at stake if same-sex marriage ever becomes the law of the land"

I asked him if he's had criticism from those on the other side of the issue, and he paused for several seconds. "Yes;" he said, "I've been accused of wanting to Christianize the state. In fact, the Speaker of the House in the Maryland legislature wrote a newspaper column in which he accused me of wanting to Christianize the state. That was a great honor, but it wasn't really my goal. It's not my job to Christianize the state: that God's job. But it is my job to speak the truth on moral issues, which happen also to be Christian issues. And it's my job to speak about the Christian heritage and founding of our great state"

The delegate related a bit of his state's history, going back to Lord Baltimore's charter from the king, and he told me, "This state has a rich Christian history, founded by Catholics. It was called the 'Free State,' established to provide a haven for those who had experienced religious persecution because of their doctrinal differences. You can read about it in the recorded history of the state of Maryland, all the way back to the Charter of 1632 where it's clearly stated that Maryland was established as a Christian colony. The territory was granted by the king on the grounds that the first governor, Lord Baltimore, was 'animated with a laudable and pious Zeal for extending the Christian Religion.'

"As I've gone to church meetings in various parts of the state;" he said, "I've witnessed repentance by pastors after they've heard this message. I've been encouraged by that, and humbled by it as well. I've been humbled because it has nothing to do with me personally but with what God is saying to us about these issues. I'm not a pastor; I'm a common man whose heart has been convicted by God to talk about things we know to be true-things that we know are founded in the Christian understanding of salvation and eternal judgment. It's not that I want to do this: it's that I can't not do it. I have to speak the truth regardless of what the political or other consequence might be. Anyone who lives a Christian life knows that when God calls you, you can't tell Him 'No,' because He's just going to keep turning you around until you do what's He's called you and prepared you to do"

EXPANDING THE MESSAGE

"I started out giving this message to pastors and church leaders, but one day

a pastor called and asked if I would speak to his congregation. He wanted to bring the entire adult membership together for it. I said I would come, but I was concerned. I didn't know what the reaction was going to be or how we would deal with it. So he said, 'I think the members of my church need to see this,' so I agreed and we did it. We had about 120 people in the sanctuary that day, all members of the church, and they were all ages, elderly, middle-aged, and young adults, but no children were present.

"When we finished showing the film," he said, "and when I finished reproving the church for its complacency, there was a surreal silence in the room. Finally the pastor said to me, 'I think we need to cancel the rest of today's program.' He had planned another program, but he said, 'I think we just need to pray.' And as he began to pray, men wept openly because of the sorrow they felt in their hearts for what they had just seen. The vile sin of homosexuality had been revealed to Christ's church, and their hearts were broken.

"This has been such an emotional experience," Delegate Dwyer told me, "seeing the tears of sorrow, the prayers of repentance, and hearing those fervent prayers. We prayed that God's people would wake up and stand up boldly on the front lines for this issue. It was encouraging to me. Experiences like that give me the strength to continue when the pressures mount against me and what I'm doing. As you can image," he said, "the argument on the street is that I'm filled with hate and that I'm spreading hate and fear among the churches. OK, I'm guilty as charged. I'm spreading hatred of the homosexual activists and I'm spreading my own fear of what's going to happen to this nation if God's people don't stand up now. I'm guilty of spreading hate and fear, but it's their hate and my fear.

"Before I was elected to public office, " he said, "one of the things I realized was that there is a lot of temptation in this place. I also knew, however, that I have a Christian heart and I will do everything I can to stay on God's path. But the first thing I did was to set up an accountability group of six godly men who have promised to beat me within an inch of my life if I ever come off of God's path. And one of those men is my own brother. Every time I meet with pastors, I ask them to hold me accountable. I know Satan will try to trip me up, and I'm made of human flesh. These battles are the ones that make Satan the angriest, so I don't ask for that accountability out of vanity. I mean it sincerely."

As we neared the end of our conversation, we stood together and prayed, and I thanked this brave man for his courage and conviction. He smiled and said, "I appreciate your encouragement, Rev. Lou, because it's not enough just to be a Christian when you serve in public office as I do. You have to be committed, and you have to be protected. I have people all over the country who pray for me, and it's rewarding to get notes as we sometimes do from people in Oregon or California or other parts of the country saying, 'Delegate Dwyer, we're praying for you, we love you, and we want to encourage you to just keep doing the work of the Lord' That's such an

encouragement, especially for my wife. It's so helpful for her, when we get those hateful calls, e-mails, and letters, as we often do, to know that there are godly people out there standing with us" I assured Delegate Dwyer that he would be continuously in our prayers as well, and that we were grateful for his example of not merely talking the talk but also walking the walk.¹¹

A CALLING TO RIGHTEOUSNESS

Not everyone can do what Don Dwyer is doing; not many have his gifts or passion for sharing this important message. But the fact is, we can all do something, and many of us simply aren't doing enough. What I have tried to say in this chapter is not that the church is useless or that she has failed to serve in many important ways. Most of our churches, even those where the flame of righteousness is flickering or has already gone out, can serve in useful ways, if nothing else by providing a sense of community for God's hungry and weary children. But I am saying that the sinfulness and brokenness of the world at this hour could never have happened if the church had been fully alert, awake, and standing at her post.

When I look around this country (and I travel constantly), I see many vibrant, exciting, and transforming churches where miracles are happening and lives are being changed. There are thousands of churches in the Traditional Values Coalition family who understand their calling to be salt and light in the world, and many of these are fully engaged on this issue. But, I'm sorry to say, I see other churches as well that are fat and lazy and self-satisfied, and many of these are so full of the world's values they're no threat to the forces of darkness that surround us.

For those churches, I have a word of warning. If your church doesn't get over its addiction to the easy life, accumulating wealth in the material world and ignoring the signs of crippling decay all around us, your children may not have a future worth defending. For the last fifty years too many church leaders have run from their responsibility of preparing Christian soldiers for spiritual combat, and the result has been the ruin of this once Christian nation. Our homes and schools and workplaces are in disarray. Homosexuals are corrupting our youth. We wonder who has done this to us. The answer is abundantly clear: we have done it to ourselves. When the church fails to be the church, they fail to keep Christ's own commission to seek and save those who are lost, including many who sit in their pews every Sunday.

This is my message, but I'm happy to say that I'm not the only one who is saying these things. The gifted priest and renowned Bible expositor Father John Corapi has called the apathy of the church a moral disgrace, and he agrees that it is high time to wake up this sleeping giant. Father Corapi has said:

Morality is not a subjective construct. Rather, it is inscribed in the

heart and mind of every person. It is our business to accept our noble and holy lot as persons, and to act in accord with nature, not rebel against it. We run the risk today in our once largely Christian country of falling into that class of idolaters which St. Paul bitterly denounced because of their refusal to worship God and accept his teaching, despite their knowledge of him (See Romans 1:20-27).¹²

It's important for believers to understand what this theologian is saying. We are all called to act in accordance with our nature and the sensibility that Christ has implanted in our hearts. When we rebel against our calling by trying to ignore the sin and evil around us, or simply by tolerating the corruptions of the world, we make ourselves enemies of God.

Many of us will recall that dramatic passage where the apostle Paul lays out the charges against those who tolerate evil in this way. He writes:

But know this, that in the last days perilous times will come: For men will be lovers of themselves, lovers of money, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, unloving, unforgiving, slanderers, without self-control, brutal, despisers of good, traitors, headstrong, haughty, lovers of pleasure rather than lovers of God, having a form of godliness but denying its power.

-2 TIMOTHY 3:1-5, NKJV

The apostle tells us, "From such people turn away!" He writes elsewhere, "For what fellowship has righteousness with lawlessness? And what communion has light with darkness?" (2 Cor. 6:14, NKJv). What a tragic irony for believers who have the word of truth to be sidelined by the deceptions of this world. As John Corapi adds:

We are not to be confused by empty rhetoric and the fallacy of what is "politically correct," especially when that is largely determined by the mind of a culture which will go down in history as grandly technological, yet singularly irrational; able to travel far into outer space, yet amazingly crippled in its ability to travel inwardly in order to be in touch with the high and lofty demands of its own moral nature. We should be mightily wary of a culture, rightly described as a "culture of death," that seeks to tell us how to live, imposing laws that are illicit and mores that are immoral.¹³

It is my hope and fervent prayer that, before it's too late and the agenda of death and destruction has overcome us utterly, God's people will rise. This work cannot be merely a hobby. My dear friend and a great defender of the unborn, Father Frank Pavone, understands the urgency of the hour, and

his words, which I've quoted in the epigraph to this chapter, are powerful and true. "Sleeping is easy; vigilance has a price" Our task at this late hour is to stand against the hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places, to wage war on the evil that would gladly corrupt and destroy all that is holy and good.

We cannot act as if this were just a hobby. It will demand every ounce of moral fiber and resolve we can muster. Are we up to it? Very much in accord with Father Pavone's words above, Thomas Jefferson said, "The price of freedom is eternal vigilance" You can be sure that those who will not defend their freedom are destined to lose it. But will the church awaken from her slumber and rise to this challenge? I pray to God that she will.

RESTORING TRADITIONAL VALUES

There are risks in standing your ground, and there are also great opportunities if we're willing to accept the challenges before us. But this means that every believer must make a commitment to fight the good fight. We need to call America back to the values enshrined in our great U.S. Constitution, and we need to pray that millions will rise up for such a time as this.

-REVEREND Louis P. SHELDON

THE NOTION OF a "separation of church and state" got its start, as most people now know, in a letter from then President Thomas Jefferson to a group of Baptists in Danbury, Connecticut, assuring them that the government would never infringe on their freedom of worship. Those of us who have been fighting to restore moral balance in this country are well aware of that document written in 1802. But there's a lesser known aspect of the story, which is that it was a virulent strain of anti-Catholicism in this country in the 1930s and '40s that actually led to the Supreme Court's *Everson v. Board of Education* ruling of 1947, and that really pushed us over the edge.

The first large waves of immigrants from Italy, Ireland, and other Catholic countries began to arrive on our shores in the 1830s, when Andrew Jackson was president. Freedom of religion was already an established principle of law, guaranteed by the First Amendment, but there were groups such as the so-called "Know Nothings," who saw this invasion of European Catholics as a threat. They said, "We can't have those Catholics coming in here and changing things. Why, they're committed to the pope!" And that created a wave of bad feelings that would continue for decades.

Over the next forty years, this uncharitable attitude led to the passage of bad laws such as the Blaine Amendments, which limited government support for parochial schools in several states, and accelerated the idea of a "separation of church and state" But it showed up most perniciously in 1947, in Justice Hugo Black's outrageous dicta in the *Everson* case, saying that the Founding Fathers had erected an imaginary "wall of separation" that must be kept "high and impregnable," and this prevented people of faith from having influence in the affairs of government. At the very least, this was an incredibly bad misreading of the Constitution, which probably involved great mischief by individuals who had undue influence on the

Court at that time. But as Professor Daniel Dreisbach points out in his important book on this subject, justice Black's own anti-Catholicism was also a major factor in that bad decision.¹

The bad news is that the separation of morality from public life has devastated this nation ever since. The Court's action in tossing Bible reading and prayer out of the schools in the 1960s was merely the beginning, and over the last fifty years corruption has eaten away the moral fabric of the schools. Today we're seeing a breakdown of law and order in all aspects of public life, an escalation of violence and indecency, and a level of hatred for Christians and others who believe in traditional values that would have utterly shocked our Founding Fathers.

The good news, however, is that because things have gone so far in the wrong direction, we are also seeing the beginnings of a counterrevolution, along with reconciliation between people of many faiths and backgrounds such as we have never seen before. It's a new day in America. There's a new level of understanding and cooperation between Protestants, Catholics, and Orthodox Jews, due in large part to the intensity of the attacks from the antireligious Left, and this new unity is changing the cultural landscape in the most astonishing ways.

Alexis de Tocqueville wrote in his book *Democracy in America*, "I do not know if all Americans have faith in their religion-for who can read the secrets of the heart?-but I am sure that they think it necessary to the maintenance of republican institutions. That is not the view of one class or party among the citizens, but of the whole nation; it is found in all ranks."² When he was asked what made American society work, the French statesman didn't hesitate to say that it was the evangelical juggernaut, and what we're seeing emerging today is every bit as powerful as what he saw then. Even though we have endured hard times in this country, and even though people of faith are still being attacked on many fronts, the juggernaut lives. Our task now is to rekindle the flame of traditional moral values and to awaken the sleeping giant.

REKINDLING THE FLAME

I think it's important to be very clear about the importance of moral leadership in government. As my friend Rev. William J. Murray has pointed out, "Government is not God," and government can never be all things to all people, as many on the Left would prefer. Furthermore, if we strip all references to God and godly morality from our nation's laws, then, by definition, government will be godless, and the laws enacted by the men and women in Congress and the fifty state legislatures will be ungodly and self-destructive.

Our Founding Fathers understood this, and they said so. William Penn

said, "Those people who will not be governed by God will be ruled by tyrants." Noah Webster, the great author and educator who gave us the first American dictionary, said, "The moral principles and precepts contained in the Scripture ought to form the basis of all our civil constitutions and laws. All the miseries and evil men suffer from vice, crime, ambition, injustice, oppression, slavery, and war, proceed from their despising or neglecting the precepts contained in the Bible" And John Jay, the first chief justice of the Supreme Court said, "Providence has given to our people the choice of their rulers, and it is the duty as well as the privilege and interest of our Christian nation to select and prefer Christians for their rulers"

What clearer warnings could we have? Yet, under the delusion that church and state cannot coexist and cooperate in the task of restraining evil and building a civil society, we have witnessed the rise of the most unimaginable evil in our time. Nothing else explains so well the rise of homosexuality as a protected civil right, or the legalization of abortion that has led to a culture of death, or the assault on moral judgment in the nation's schools and colleges. Young people in America today know all about sex, drugs, and rock 'n' roll, but they know next to nothing about the true history of this nation or the great moral and religious precepts that were prescribed by our Founding Fathers.

With the help of groups such as the ACLU, People for the American Way, and others of their ilk, the Left has waged a relentless assault on moral judgment for the last hundred years, but we in the church are not entirely free of blame. From the standpoint of politics, too many Christians have been holding their finger up to the wind waiting for "the right time" to speak up. Well, first of all, let me say that it's never too early to stand on moral principle, but there's never been a better time for people of faith to rise up and speak up for what we believe.

I received a memo not long ago from Richard Viguerie, who is the godfather of the direct-mail business and a long-time friend, saying that in the wake of the 2004 general election, those on the left of the political spectrum have suddenly found themselves in a catch-22 situation. If they don't move to the right and embrace moral values, they will be forced into minority status for a generation. If they do move to the right, however, they will disenfranchise their radical-left base and, once again, be forced into minority status for a generation. I think that's a very perceptive analysis.

The caveat, however, is that Republicans and other conservative voters must make it clear that they are committed to defending traditional Judeo-Christian values. "From the White House to the Courts;" continued Richard Viguerie in the memo, "there is no benefit to be gained from going soft on moral values" I agree, but that view is no longer merely the opinion of those of us on the Religious Right. In an op-ed piece for the San Diego Union, published just five days after the Republican victory of November 2004, former Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich wrote that a majority of American voters have realized that they are "deeply estranged from the

establishment left, which is the national mainstream media, the liberal elite, the trial lawyers, Hollywood, the unions, and left-wing ethnic politicians, who collectively make the most noise."³

The reason for this separation of sensibilities, he said, is because the Left has lost touch with what Americans really believe. The sudden emergence of the "values voters" is evidence of "an America that is trying to instill in their children the moral values that the establishment left has rejected" And until the Left changes its tune, there can be no compromise. Symbolic of this change of attitude was the defeat of Senate Minority Leader Senator Tom Daschle in his race against my good friend and former Congressman John Thune of South Dakota. Quite simply, Gingrich said, Daschle was defeated because the voters of his state realized "that he had more in common with Michael Moore, who came to personify the worst of the Hollywood left, than he did with rural farmers"

RESTORING THE COVENANT SOCIETY

These are powerful ideas, and they're really catching on. In January 2005, Mr. Gingrich was interviewed on The 700 Club about his new book *Winning the Future*, and Pat Robertson asked the former Speaker if he thought, in light of the Republican victory in November, that conservatives would be willing to step up and fight for what we believe in. Gingrich said he did, and that incidents such as Michael Newdow's attack on the Pledge of Allegiance might be enough to rouse even the most comfortable and complacent Americans out of their armchairs. Gingrich went on to say:

I am hoping that will arouse people of belief, people who understand that there is a Creator, to decide to reenter this fight, and say, "Look, our Declaration of Independence is very straightforward. We are endowed by our Creator with certain inalienable rights. Now either that is a fact that is the basis of America, or we are just randomly-gathered protoplasm having a contract relationship" I think we are a covenant society, and I think part of the message has to be to our elected officials that we expect Congress and the President to stand up to judges who don't understand America.⁴

When asked to elaborate on what he meant in saying that the president ought to stand up to judges, Mr. Gingrich reminded the audience that Presidents Thomas Jefferson and James Madison at one point, using their constitutional authority, simply eliminated the judgeships of a group of magistrates who were waging war on the White House from the bench. Those judges tried to appeal their dismissal, but no judge would take the case for fear of losing their jobs, too. After explaining that point, Gingrich said:

And in the case of the two appeals court judges of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals who said they were going to outlaw saying "one nation under God" in the Pledge, my position would be Thomas Jefferson's, which would be to abolish their two jobs. Let them go back into the private sector, because clearly those two judges do not understand America and should not be sitting on the federal bench.⁵

Those were strong words and very good advice. But even if it's unlikely that the president or Congress would be willing to take such drastic measures, it is nevertheless important to be reminded that all judges, from the Supreme Court to the local justice of the peace, serve at the pleasure of the people and their elected representatives. Article III of the U.S. Constitution says, "The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one supreme court and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish" What Congress makes, Congress can unmake, and that ought to be fair warning to judges who think they are empowered to override the will of the people and legislate bad laws from the bench.

I was also encouraged by the Speaker's comment that we are a "covenant society" As a former history professor, Mr. Gingrich understands what the Pilgrims who landed at Plymouth in 1620 were really saying when they penned the Mayflower Compact as a covenant of good faith between the colonists and as a covenant of profound religious faith in a benevolent Creator God. The reason the Left fights so intensely, and the reason that a post-Christian Europe has turned against America in recent years, is precisely because we are a covenant people. That covenant means we care about one another, and we are determined to resist policies and practices that put Americans at risk. It means also that we want to honor God in all we do, so that His hand of blessing will remain upon this nation forever.

FUNDAMENTAL TRUTHS

Those who want to abolish moral standards, however, are outraged by these ideas. Homosexuals in particular see such language as a threat to their lifestyle, and that's another reason why they fight any expression of moral judgment in the public arena. The covenant idea, as it says in the Declaration of Independence, expresses the understanding of the Founding Fathers that government is given to us by God so that we can govern ourselves. And self-government is the key to good government. If we learn nothing else from the 2004 election, let us learn this: values voters are people who believe that ordered liberty demands a moral standard, and they will no longer put their trust in candidates who refuse to honor our fundamental values and beliefs.

Homosexuality grows out of social disorder in the family, along with

various other factors. Psychologists who specialize in treating men and women with same-sex attractions tell us that homosexuality is rarely a factor in families where there are fathers who are training their sons and daughters in a morally responsible manner and mothers who uphold standards of respect and decency in the home. These are values that are fundamental to society, and furthermore, they are values that help to bring people together from all the various racial and ethnic groups in this country.

Black, white, brown, and every variation of race and national origin: we are all united in our desire to see our children grow up strong and healthy, with good social skills. And I believe this is the real hope of reconciliation for this country. But it is also important to say that the causes of homosexuality are complex and variable, and can't be diagnosed by simple formulas. This is why groups such as NARTH and Exodus International provide such a valuable service.⁶

In a column for the Boston Globe published in March 2004, Jeff Jacoby pointed out that African Americans have really stepped up to the plate in the defense of biblical morality. Homosexuals have tried to co-opt the language of civil rights to convince Americans that they are an oppressed minority. As I have indicated already, this is a false and dangerously misleading analogy, but Christian leaders in the black community aren't letting that fraud go unchallenged.

As Jacoby points out in his column, when Ezell Blair, David Richmond, Joseph McNeil, and Franklin McCain took their seat at the Greensboro Lunch Counter in 1960, they weren't trying to force some sort of revolutionary change on the nation. They weren't trying to make behaviors legal that had been judged illegal and immoral throughout human history. They were simply asking for the same respect and the same rights that whites already enjoyed: the right to be served a decent lunch and to pay for it with their own money, just like everyone else.

Homosexuals, as Jacoby says so well, "cloak their demands in the language of civil rights because it sounds so much better than the truth. They don't want to accept or reject marriage on the same terms that it is available to everyone else. They want it on entirely new terms. They want it to be given a meaning it has never before had, and they prefer that it be done undemocratically-by judicial fiat, for example, or by mayors flouting the law. Whatever else that may be," he writes, "it isn't civil rights."⁷

When a group of distinguished black clergy spoke up and challenged lawmakers in Massachusetts to reject the false claims of the homosexual lobby and to support the historic definition of marriage as the union of "one man and one woman," the homosexual lobby hit the roof. One left-wing assemblyman jumped to his feet to exclaim, "Martin Luther King is rolling over in his grave at a statement like this!" Of course, nothing could be further from the truth. As Jeff Jacoby went on to say:

But if anything has King spinning in his grave, it is the indecency of exploiting his name for a cause he never supported. The civil rights movement for which he lived and died was grounded in a fundamental truth: All of us are created equal. The same-sex marriage movement, by contrast, is grounded in the denial of a fundamental truth: The Creator who made us equal made us male and female.⁸

A SUMMIT OF BLACK PASTORS

In the fall of 2004, as it appeared that the courts and several state legislatures were prepared to force same-sex marriage on the nation against our will, the Traditional Values Coalition called together a group of one hundred sixty African American bishops, pastors, ministers, evangelists, and religious leaders to come to Washington to call on Congress to take a strong stand in support of traditional marriage and to demonstrate their support for the black family (and all others) by passing a constitutional amendment that would settle the matter for all time. They want an amendment that will insure liberal federal judges and local officials will not be able to force their values on the rest of us.

At the end of the summit, the pastors invited the Congressional Black Caucus (CBC) members to meet with them so the pastors could share their views on marriage. When they addressed the Congressional Black Caucus, a group that ought to be their natural allies in this cause, the ministers pointed out that further assaults on the black family should be the last thing they wanted, particularly since fully 74 percent of the African American community have said they want to protect the concept of traditional marriage as the union of one man and one woman.

In a document submitted to the CBC, the church leaders said, "It's no secret that black families have been under assault in recent years. Divorce, teenage pregnancy, fatherless homes, and a disproportionate number of HIV-AIDS cases are all unattractive aspects of the black family landscape. In addition, new research shows that there are already clear signs of long-term marital breakdown of the black family... two out of every three newborn blacks enter the world with an unwed mother and no consistent father figure." And the obvious implication, they said, is that, "Further destabilization of traditional marriage must be prevented at all costs"⁹

Sadly, the pleas of these ardent leaders fell on deaf ears, and the members of Congress who ought to have been most sympathetic to their concerns rebuffed them and sent them away empty-handed. Representative John Lewis, a Georgia Democrat and a member of the CBC, stood and said, "I just want to set the record straight here. Some of these so-called black ministers and so-called civil rights leaders never supported civil rights. They never marched one day. They never put their bodies on the line for the cause of

civil rights" And he added imperiously that, "Coretta Scott King, the widow of Martin Luther King Jr., is opposed to this amendment."¹⁰

In the end, six members of the CBC did vote to protect marriage as a result of our direct lobbying efforts in their districts. It was also the result of the Ministers and Pastors Summit hosted by the Traditional Values Coalition to reach out to leaders in the African American church. Representative Harold Ford of Memphis, Tennessee, received over four thousand phone calls; Representative William Jefferson of New Orleans received close to forty-five hundred phone calls. That made the difference.

For the party of the Left, politics supersedes morality, and the power of the homosexual lobby for many in that room apparently meant more than the power of their own constituents-black, white, and brown. But the outcry from the Christian community was not lost. Three major denominations of Greater Boston's black clergy met and announced their opposition to the homosexual constitutional amendment that overturned the state constitution of Massachusetts. All over the country, the black church community has been outspoken on this issue. They are tired of seeing homosexuals using the language of their hard-won "civil rights" for immoral purposes.

On May 17, 2004, the day that the state of Massachusetts began issuing marriage licenses to homosexuals, the Traditional Values Coalition brought a group of eighty black pastors here to Washington. The coalition sponsored another event in Memphis shortly thereafter for three hundred pastors. We had another three hundred black pastors at an event in Atlanta, and then we hosted a twenty-four-hour round-the-clock summit in Washington on September 8 and 9, with some two hundred African American pastors meeting in prayer and fellowship, and then speaking up for traditional marriage on Capitol Hill.

Together, we lobbied the Congressional Black Caucus and picked up those six votes. Later, on September 20, we met with five hundred mostly Hispanic pastors in East Los Angeles County. In February 2005, Rev. Frederick K. C. Price, pastor of the Crenshaw Christian Center, a large dynamic church in Los Angeles, sponsored a conference at his facility to rally the African American community behind this important issue.

This is just a sign of the momentum that is building around this issue. Black pastors are very important to the cause, but it's not just one group, one denomination, or one tradition that's involved. What we are seeing is a tremendous regrouping of evangelical Christians, conservative Roman Catholics, and orthodox Jews, all of whom share a common concern for the deplorable state of contemporary culture and all of whom, for the first time in living memory, are united in their efforts to stop the advance of immorality and return this nation to its roots. What could be more exciting than that?

There's a reformation taking place, and the old lines don't hold anymore. There is a new and exciting realignment within Christianity, and the crisis that mainline churches, including the Episcopal Church, the Methodist Church, and the Presbyterian Church (USA), are going through today is just the birth pangs of an explosive awakening that's just about to happen. What we're going through now, since the fall of 2004, is the birth pangs of a tremendous new movement of faith and moral judgment that will most certainly include (as Alexis de Tocqueville would surely applaud) a reawakening of the evangelical juggernaut.

LEARNING THE ROPES

I can't begin to tell you how happy it makes me to see these signs of renewal coming forth from all parts of the country. I remember vividly the day in 1972 when my friend and colleague Dr. Walter Martin walked into my office and said, "Lou, the homosexuals are on the march!" To be honest, I couldn't imagine what Walter was talking about at that time. There was no gay rights movement of any notable size in 1972. I hadn't been paying attention to the issue, and I worried frankly that Walter had been watching too many late-night movies on TV.

But when I looked up, Walter said, "They're getting ready to repeal the sodomy laws" And I thought, What does that mean? So I asked him, "Sodomy law? What's a sodomy law, Walter?" That's how naive I was in those days. But over the next hour or so, he told me all about it, and then Walter said to me prophetically: "If they remove the sodomy laws, then they'll make it legal for the homosexual lifestyle to be taught and presented as a viable lifestyle alternative. At that point, there will be nothing stopping them."

That conversation took place over thirty-three years ago, and that's when I became involved in the effort to stop the homosexual agenda. Pat Boone, the great entertainer who now heads a number of important foundations and Christian service organizations, was also interested in this issue, and we became good friends at that time. We met to compare notes on the things that Walter Martin had learned, and we decided to begin contacting people in the California legislature to encourage them to stand against the homosexual lobby.

The problem was that everywhere we went there was almost total ignorance on this issue. The homosexual community was well armed and already very active. But the church was disengaged, and there were no strong defenders of traditional values in this battle. Still worse, however, the church wasn't just ignorant about political engagement, but many church leaders were dead set against any sort of discourse on these important social and political issues. On many occasions wellmeaning Christian leaders would warn us about getting involved in political action, saying that it was

unbiblical and dangerous.

At one point, after it became clear to me that political action was going to be a bigger part of my ministry, my own pastor came to me and said, "Lou, if you get involved in politics, you'll lose your anointing" I listened, of course, and I thought deeply about that challenge, but I knew it couldn't be true. That was 1972. The separation of church and state was a relatively new fact of life, but that insidious doctrine had already left its mark. The level of ignorance among many evangelicals at the time was as thick as a London fog. So I prayed very seriously, and I soon realized that if I didn't get involved politically I would lose my anointing.

So that's when I really got started. We went to Sacramento to talk to the legislature. We tried to stop a measure being pushed by the Hollywood crowd and the liberal media granting special rights to homosexuals. We tried to stop it, but it passed both houses. We tried to repeal it, and we couldn't do that either. Then, in 1977, while I was working with Pat Robertson on some of these things, actress and singer Anita Bryant, who was an outspoken opponent of the gay agenda, called state senator John Briggs and encouraged him to bring me up to Sacramento to help with a new ballot initiative for the upcoming elections. The goal this time was to keep homosexuality from being taught in the public schools.

Senator Briggs called me, and I went to see him at his office. He said, "Lou, we only have one shot at stopping this thing. We have to get six hundred thousand signatures on a petition to put the measure on the ballot, and we have one year to do it." Well, that was my challenge, and I began going around to churches all over the state, talking to people on the street or wherever I could, trying to get some momentum behind the effort. Over the next year we probably spent as much as \$300,000 doing it, but we got the signatures, and we got the initiative on the ballot. It was a great team effort, and that became our model for getting Christians active in the political process. As it turned out, we were ahead of our time.

We had done everything we could, and we came so close to stopping that bad bill. But Ronald Reagan, a former Hollywood actor who still had friends in the homosexual community, was governor of California at the time, and he wasn't ready to fight that battle. In the end he came down on the other side of the issue. He said, "Live and let live;" and Republicans in the state legislature weren't prepared to fight both the homosexual lobby and the governor. The deciding vote was cast by Merv Dymally, a member of the California legislature, and Governor Reagan did not veto it. So it ended there, and the children of California are still paying the price.

HARSH REALITIES

California, where I live and spend my time when I'm not working on Capitol

Hill, is an interesting place, primarily because it's often a frontrunner in national trends. There's a strong conservative base in the state that's often overpowered, unfortunately, by the enormous and persuasive media culture that's there as well. What we tend to see, rather than the values of all the hard-working mothers and fathers who are trying to raise decent families, are the trendy values of Hollywood and the lifestyles of the rich and scandalous in places like San Francisco and Los Angeles. And in that environment, even our political victories are often cast as defeats.

For example, in December 2004, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, who was elected to replace the very liberal Governor Gray Davis, who was recalled and turned out of office by popular referendum, made a trip to Germany. On that trip, the governor told a German newspaper that the Republican Party that elected him needs to "cross the center line" and slide more to the left politically. That remark, as I said in an editorial for the Los Angeles Times at the time, made it clear that Schwarzenegger somehow didn't get the message of the November election, in which Republicans held the White House and gained seats in both the House and the Senate.¹¹

Schwarzenegger, who is a fiscal conservative and a social liberal, clearly wasn't watching when fourteen states passed initiatives banning gay marriage. Instead, he may have been listening to his wife, Maria Shriver, and her uncle, Democrat Senator Ted Kennedy of Massachusetts, who were no doubt wringing their hands because of the sudden appearance of "values voters" at the polls and what they perceived as the extremism of the "Religious Right." These are the same people, after all, who had predicted a Kerry landslide and civil war in the Republican Party.

But Schwarzenegger told the German reporter, "I'd like the Republican Party to cross that center line;" meaning that he advocates taking more liberal positions on social issues. He predicted that Republicans could pick up at least 5 percent more votes if they were more like the Democrats. Well, to put it charitably, that wasn't the message most of us got in November, and it's not the message the vast majority of values voters got either.

If the election had turned out to be a rejection of traditional values, Schwarzenegger's argument might have made more sense. But the fact is, traditional values won, and the governor got it exactly backward. Smart Democrats are doing all they can to look more like Republicans in order to attract more voters and campaign contributions. In the end, the leopard cannot change his spots, and while many on the Left may embrace the subterfuge of liberals pretending to support moral values-as, for example, Howard Dean and Hillary Clinton are trying to do-the record is there for everyone to see, and it's perfectly clear what those people are up to.

If you want to see what support for the homosexual agenda and other left-wing policies can do when it invades an organization, take a look at what has happened to the liberal mainline denominations. The Episcopal Church USA has been drifting leftward for decades and condoned the

ordination of Rev. V. Eugene Robinson, an outspoken homosexual, as bishop of New Hampshire in August 2003. Since 1965, the number of Episcopalians has fallen from 3.6 million to fewer than 2.3 million in 2002. Of those, only about 850,000 actually attend services most Sundays. Recently 18 Anglican archbishops from third world nations called on the Episcopal Church USA to repent of their pro-homosexual policies and pleaded with them to revoke Gene Robinson's ordination. But the ECUSA clergy were unwilling to do that, and as a result the denomination continues to bleed members at an astonishing pace.

The United Methodist Church, which has been the most homosexual friendly of all the mainline denominations, has lost more than half its membership since the late-1950s. The Presbyterian Church (USA) has lost a comparable percentage, including some 41,812 members in 2002 alone.

I completed my master of divinity degree at Princeton Theological Seminary in 1960 and was ordained in the United Presbyterian Church. Over the next twenty-five years that denomination went through some very troubling changes, and I decided I needed to make some changes as well. I was ordained as a minister in the conservative Presbyterian Church in America (PCA) in 1989, where I've been ever since. Since the downward spiral began in the Presbyterian Church (USA) in the mid-1960s, membership has fallen from 4.2 million to just 2.4 million today. But here's the good news: other evangelical, charismatic, Pentecostal, and independent Bible-believing churches have been growing at a record pace since the mid-1970s, largely at the expense of the mainline denominations that have turned away from biblical inerrancy and moved toward the acceptance and affirmation of homosexuality-even among the clergy.

Four of the top twenty-five denominations today, according to the annual yearbook of the National Council of Churches, are Pentecostal, and seven of the largest twenty-five denominations in the country are predominantly African American, where biblical doctrine and conservative teaching are still emphasized. Two of those denominations, the National Baptist Convention of America and the National Baptist Convention, USA, have a combined 8.5 million members. So it's not that nobody's going to church anymore; it's that they're not wasting their time in churches that no longer heed the Word of God.

THE ATTACK ON RELIGION

There's no way to mistake what the Bible has to say about the sin of homosexuality without wildly misreading and misinterpreting what's written there in black and white. But, of course, this is precisely what homosexuals and their enablers have been trying to do for years. Metropolitan Community churches, which cater primarily to homosexuals and lesbians, and the so-called "affirming churches" in various denominations have had to "re-

imagine" in the most outrageous ways what God has said, and what the prophets and apostles revealed in both the Old and New Testaments, in order to convince their followers that homosexuality is not, as the Bible says, an abomination (Lev. 18:22).

But homosexuals are determined not only to force their lifestyle on us, but also they plan on doing it by using government and the courts to silence the opposition. This is why "antidiscrimination" laws and "hate speech" legislation is such a recurrent theme. Senator Kennedy and homosexual activist Representative Barney Frank have been pushing laws for years that would define religious objections to homosexuality as hate speech. The tragedy is that being told that homosexuality is a sin and that it is dangerous and potentially fatal can save lives. That's the message I've been trying to give for thirty-three years now, but if these powerful men have their way, warning people about these risks will one day be against the law.

As we have already seen in Canada and certain parts of Europe, simply preaching the gospel and citing biblical passages that warn of the sin of homosexuality may one day be hate crimes in this country. Laws like that could then be used to silence other kinds of religious speech—not just about homosexuality but about many other things. In March 2004, when actor Mel Gibson's powerful film *The Passion of the Christ* was released in theaters in this country, anti-Christian groups called on Attorney General John Ashcroft and the Justice Department to censor the film because it would incite violence against Jews or other non-Christians.

But the activists don't stop there. Since the early 1970s they have been very successful at pushing their agenda into the schools and colleges with programs such as the "safe schools" projects, which claim to make schools more accepting of homosexuals and transgender students. This includes creating "safe places" where sexually confused or "questioning" kids can gather to network and, naturally, get even more involved in the homosexual lifestyle. If these things continue, and if an entire generation of young Americans is persuaded that homosexuality is good and natural and normal, then Bible-believing Christians will soon find they have lost their children to an oppressive, sexualized culture that can't help but degenerate into anarchy and totalitarianism.

Free speech will be a thing of the past; freedom of religion will be restricted or banished. Children will be subjected to homosexual indoctrination, and parental rights will be subverted. And it will get even worse. Today the homosexual lobby is working with the United Nations to make "sexual orientation" a "universal human right" that must be protected by the UN and the World Court, with draconian punishment and enforcement measures for those who resist. In March 2004, a proposal to do just that was withdrawn by a group of Brazilian homosexuals, because of bad timing problems, I imagine, but rest assured that the measure will show up again, with Canada and the European Union leading the way. Today the Traditional Values Coalition is monitoring these trends, but the situation is

grave and our work is cut out for us.

WHAT YOU CAN Do

Obviously, I cannot fight this battle by myself, and that's why I'm so grateful that God has blessed this ministry and put us in a position to speak with and for committed believers all over America. It is an honor for us to have the opportunity to lobby for Christian values in the nation's capital. I hear from Christians who are deeply concerned about these issues every day of the year. Our office in Washington receives hundreds of calls, letters, faxes, and e-mails with words of encouragement and with various kinds of spiritual and financial support. This is what keeps us going.

When people support the work of the Traditional Values Coalition in fighting against the totalitarian agenda of the homosexual lobby, they are taking a stand for moral values and helping to preserve the kind of America the Founding Fathers meant for us to have. In addition to our Web site-www.traditionalvalues.org-we produce a hard-hitting newsletter and a weekly e-mail bulletin that goes out to hundreds of thousands of homes and offices with news about what's happening on the national scene. These are available to all our supporters and friends.

In addition, we are honored to know that there's a growing network of men and women who are willing to write letters, send e-mails, and call their federal and state legislators and local public officials to encourage them to stand up for traditional values and to defend our First Amendment guarantees of free speech and the freedom of religion. I can assure you that a personal, handwritten letter to a congressman or senator carries a lot of weight. And even for those lawmakers who may not agree with us on these issues, taking the time to express your feelings about the dangers of the homosexual agenda can be a powerful weapon for good.

I also ask our supporters and friends to be willing to write letters to the editor of the local newspaper, to respond to articles that promote the homosexual lifestyle, and also to make sure that their friends, family, and fellow church members know how they feel about the threats to religious freedom coming from the homosexual agenda. If we don't speak up, nobody will do it for us. So we need to educate our local school officials on the efforts of homosexuals to recruit children and to undermine the moral framework of American society.

I'm sorry to say that sometimes the most difficult task is to get pastors and church leaders to speak out on these issues. The secular culture has convinced a lot of them that it's not loving or tolerant to speak boldly about homosexual sin. This is a lie of Satan, and it disturbs me that so many men and women who ought to know better have allowed themselves to be compromised by it. But it's always a good idea to speak from the heart with

these people and to maintain a strong witness for the truth.

Encourage your pastor to establish a public affairs representative in your church who will monitor how the homosexual agenda is impacting your schools and community. Encourage him also to preach about the dangers of homosexual activism to our way of life. We have produced a comprehensive thirty-eight-minute film, called *Gay Rights, Special Rights*, that makes a powerful statement on this issue. This film can be a great way to get adult classes and Bible study groups to focus more seriously on the risks of the homosexual lifestyle.

We live in a new age of interactive media, with so many more tools to influence the culture than we have ever had before. Consequently, I also encourage our supporters to call in to conservative and Christian talk shows when the subject of homosexuality is being discussed. This may not be the time to start quoting Scripture, but it's certainly a good time to talk about the tragic consequences of homosexuality, the shortened life expectancy, statistics on disease and death, and other factors that are there by God's design to keep people away from these destructive behaviors. And of course the Internet is a great place to get these ideas out to people who need to know more about what's going on.

STEPPING OUT IN FAITH

For some folks who read this book, running for elected office may be a very real and logical option. Test the waters in your community. Are there openings in city government that may be in line with your knowledge and skills? Are there school-board elections or other places where your insights could make a difference? Some people may be qualified as judges, mayors, state legislators, or perhaps members of Congress or the United States Senate. None of these will be a shoo-in, and in some of them special talents and skills may be required. But unless men and women with strong moral values and a willingness to serve step up to the plate, other people with very different values will be more than happy to do it. So be bold and find a place to serve.

Not least in this list of things you can do, I would encourage you to stay informed about what's happening in this arena, to watch for breaking news that will affect you and your family, and to communicate with your representatives in Congress and the United States Senate and your state legislators when those in the homosexual lobby attempt to undermine your values and beliefs. I hope you will become familiar as well with the Traditional Values Coalition Web site (www.traditionalvalues.org), which we keep up-to-date with important news in this and many related areas.

Our staff in Washington and other parts of the country are on guard around the clock, but we can't do it all by ourselves. We depend on your

input, not only in taking the message to your community and friends, but also in being our eyes and ears on the frontlines. The letters I receive from friends and supporters are a tremendous encouragement to me, assuring me that, with God's help, we're in this battle together.

While you're at it, please encourage your friends, neighbors, and business associates to take action as well. You can keep them informed by e-mailing them news items from our Web site or forwarding our e-mail news briefs dealing with the homosexual agenda and other cultural issues. Those on the other side of this issue aren't wasting any time. Groups like the Human Rights Campaign and the Gay & Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation have large staffs and huge budgets, and they are working around the clock to force their values down our throats. There's no time to waste, and the work is demanding.

When it comes right down to it, you and I are the ones who will decide if the homosexual agenda succeeds in America. We can either fight for moral judgment and biblical truth, or we can back away and hope that somebody else will take care of it. But unless we take a firm stand, the other side will be more than happy to claim the prize they're really after-introducing another generation of America's children to a way of life that will destroy them. There's no middle ground in this struggle, so now's the time to fight.

One reason we find ourselves in such dire straits at this hour is because too many Americans have been paralyzed by this subject. They are afraid to speak out about this politically charged issue, and that has to change. That's why I have made a commitment to devote my time and every ounce of energy to this work, calling God's people back into action. If we leave these issues to those who have no problem with the moral collapse of this nation, then nothing will change. America will slide further and further down that slippery slope. Homosexuals will invade our workplaces, our schools, our churches, and even our homes, and before long there will be no place left to stand.

There are risks in standing your ground, and there are also great opportunities if we're willing to accept the challenges before us. But this means that every believer must make a commitment to fight the good fight. We need to call America back to the values enshrined in our great U. S. Constitution, and we need to pray that millions will rise up for such a time as this.

As I've said throughout these pages, nations wither and die when they turn their back on God's moral law. But if we can work together to restore traditional values in this nation, and if we will renew our commitment to serve the God who gave us liberty and life, then there's no force on earth that can stop us. So what are we waiting for?

10

WHAT'S TO BE DONE?

As many as I love, I rebuke and chasten. Therefore be zealous and repent. Behold, I stand at the door and knock. If anyone hears My voice and opens the door, I will come in to him and dine with him, and he with Me. To him who overcomes I will grant to sit with Me on My throne, as I also overcame and sat down with My Father on His throne. He who has an ear, let him hear what the Spirit says to the churches.

-REVELATION 3:19-22, NKJV

IN THIS BOOK I have spoken strongly against the homosexual agenda, and I've been especially pointed in my comments about homosexual activists, organizers, and their supporters who have adopted the terminology and tactics of war to silence and intimidate their adversaries. I have no sympathy for those who, knowing full well that the homosexual lifestyle is destroying lives every hour of the day and condemning millions not only to a living hell but also to eternal damnation, continue to rage against moral judgment and Christian virtues. Their tactics are wicked and their practices are vile. Somehow, in God's name, they must be stopped.

But let me be quick to say that I do not hate homosexuals, and I know that there are many caring and well-meaning men and women trapped in the homosexual lifestyle who would give anything to be free of it. I know there are sons and daughters who pray daily for deliverance and forgiveness but cannot break their habits and addictions. I also know there are some who actually do break with the lifestyle for a time only to slip back; for them homosexuality is not gay but has become a nightmare with no end. All these men and women have my deepest compassion and prayers, and I hope that my words in these pages, while unapologetic in portraying the sin of the homosexual agenda, will not weaken the spirits of those on the verge of transformation but will help spark a renewed commitment and even greater resolve to seek a way of escape.

THE SHEPARD CASE

To help put this in context, let me tell you about an incident that happened a few years ago in the midst of all the furor surrounding the Matthew

Shepard murder case. Shepard, as you may recall, was a homosexual college student who approached two men in a bar, apparently to solicit sex. Subsequently, depending on which version of the story you believe, the men went with him to a desolate stretch of highway where they murdered the young man in cold blood and left him strung up on a barbed wire fence. That was a hideous and brutal act, for which the law justifiably makes no excuse. But, of course, the homosexual community leapt on the case as an example of the kinds of "gay bashing" homosexuals endure. The fact is, such cases are very rare, but it was just the sort of thing the activists were looking for to help them win the media battle.

Within days the police apprehended the killers, and in due course the case came to trial at the state courthouse in Laramie, Wyoming. And even though it was an exceptional situation, I knew I had to go witness the proceedings. So in November 1998, I flew to Laramie as an observer, accompanied by my colleague James Lafferty, who is also my son-in-law and communications consultant. The fact that Shepard was a homosexual made the case a national media event, and the activists were out in force. Thanks to their grandstanding, along with the frenzy of the reporters, photographers, and network crews that showed up for the trial, the event turned out to be a huge media circus.

When we arrived at the courthouse in Laramie, Jim and I saw what looked like two rival gangs lined up like armies on the field of battle. On one side were the homosexual activists who ringed the entire courthouse lawn, wearing angel costumes complete with large wings. Facing them and yelling insults in their faces were the forces of Rev. Fred Phelps and his supporters from the Westboro Baptist Church in Topeka, Kansas. Phelps has become notorious in recent years for attending homosexual rallies of all kinds and displaying provocative signs saying things like, "God Hates Fags" For this case, Phelps and friends had gone to even greater lengths to provoke the homosexuals by setting up a Web site on the Internet with a graphic of Matthew Shepard standing in the flames of hell.

So all this was happening when we arrived. The homosexuals were yelling and making an incredible scene, while Phelps and his people were matching them decibel for decibel, and both camps were in good voice that day. As I walked up to the courthouse with Jim, we saw a crowd of at least fifty news people with all their equipment—notebooks, microphones, and cameras—recording that outrageous scene. But as soon as they spotted me, virtually the entire contingent came racing over, and they wanted to know what the Bible has to say about people like Rev. Phelps and the charges he was making.

I told them that I was very concerned about the bad impression that Phelps was making with his vicious attacks saying that homosexuals cannot be saved. "Like any other person who sins," I told the reporters, "homosexuals can be saved by repenting and accepting Jesus Christ as their Savior" I explained that Jesus Christ died on the cross for all of us and that

no sin, including homosexuality, is so great that Jesus will not forgive the sinner if he or she sincerely repents of their sin.

As serious as the case was, and as concerned as we all were about how the news coverage would be received that day, it was really comical to watch those reporters from CNN, CBS, the New York Times, and many other major media outlets racing back and forth between where Jim and I were standing and where Rev. Phelps was camped out. Jim said it looked like a tennis match at Wimbledon! On several occasions, Rev. Phelps would misquote Scripture to make his case, or perhaps he would use a quote out of context, and then I would have to explain the passage to the reporters, telling them what it actually said and meant.

Later, when I was asked to appear on Court TV, I was able to give a summary of the debate that had been going on that day between Phelps and me. At one point Jim asked me, "Did you ever think when you decided to come up here that you would be talking about the Scriptures to all these reporters and they would be writing it down?"

I just smiled at Jim and said, "There was a reason for coming here today." I knew that God had given us a chance to show that Christians are not instruments of hate. Yes, we need to be honest about the sin of homosexuality, but we must not forget that Christ came to save the lost—even these wicked men in angels' wings. And on that day, we were able to give that message loud and clear.

There is hope, and over the years I have met many ex-gays who have bravely come forward to testify to the miracle of God's love that allowed them to overcome their bondage to sin. But what we also need to understand is that the promoters of the homosexual agenda don't want to let any of those captives escape. Their strength, they believe, is in numbers, and that's why they resist so fiercely and why they recruit our children in the schools, on the playgrounds, and in the shopping malls. This is why they have such contempt for groups like the Boy Scouts who deny them access to young men pledged to honor God and country and to remain morally straight.

Furthermore, this is why they've built a massive empire with expansive multistory office complexes in major urban centers, like the national headquarters of the Human Rights Campaign in Washington DC, where they meet to orchestrate their well-financed assaults on morality, decency, and the law. I will never lose hope that God may save some of them and call them out of the lifestyle. But, on the other hand, so long as these large and well-funded activist groups continue to prosper, they remain a threat to our way of life. So long as they continue to recruit our children, they must be counted as enemies in the land. That is the sad reality.

EXPOSING THE LIE

For decades, these activists have claimed that same-sex attraction is inborn, hard-wired, and can't be changed. More recently, however, some activists in the transgender community-meaning cross-dressers and those who take on the characteristics of the opposite sex-have been saying that sexual orientation is fluid, and that it can change back and forth. In other words, someone can be a male homosexual one day and a female transvestite the next. I could say more about this, but let's just say the mixed messages say a lot about the hypocrisy of the movement.

At one time homosexuals referred to their lifestyle as a "sexual preference" Before long, however, they changed the terminology because they recognized that most people would perceive that a "preference" is actually a "choice" So the new term became "sexual orientation;" which was morally neutral and suggested that there was an innate predisposition involved.

In two exhaustive and eye-opening studies of the homosexual network and the public health disasters it has spawned, Enrique T. Rueda exposes the posturing and pretense behind the homosexual claims. He shows how the disinformation campaign implemented by the homosexual lobby has succeeded in changing our laws and corrupting the entire social fabric of American culture. These books are not light reading, by any stretch, but they are among the most powerful and authoritative works I have ever seen on this subject.¹

The "born gay" argument is perhaps the most pernicious deception being put forth today. A homosexual lobbying group at the University of Washington, called the Gay, Bisexual, Lesbian, Transgender Commission, has made the claim that, "Homosexuality is not a choice any more than being left-handed or having blue eyes or being heterosexual is a choice. It's an orientation, part of who you are. The choice is in deciding how to live your life."² As we've seen repeatedly, there's absolutely no credible scientific evidence to support that assertion. But, of course, those who are predisposed to receive the message are quick to take what sounds like science from a major university and use it to silence reasonable dissent.

The National Education Association and the American Psychological Association, for example, were quick to grab onto the "born gay" myth, which they trumpeted in a pamphlet called, "Just the Facts" That booklet was sent to every school superintendent in every public school district in America. In it they cited research that supposedly showed, "Sexual orientation is one component of a person's identity, which is made up of many other components, such as culture, ethnicity, gender, and personality traits"³ This falsehood was subsequently spread far and wide as proof of the biological connection to homosexual behavior.

The purpose of such statements is not merely to defend behavior but to prevent groups such as the National Association for Research and Therapy of Homosexuality (NARTH), headed by my good friend Dr. Joseph Nicolosi, from countering their message with solid evidence that the homosexual addiction can be overcome. Homosexual activists and their allies at the NEA and APA claimed that "sexual orientation" is built-in. Pro-homosexual politicians and lobbyists here in Washington keep saying that we have no right to discriminate against homosexuals and that Congress must legislate "special rights" to protect these innocent people from attack.

But the research is unequivocal: there is no such thing as a 'gay gene' There is no innate biological condition that makes some men engage in sodomy and that makes some women become lesbians. Groups like NARTH and Exodus International have published dozens of first-person accounts from ex-gays whose lives have been transformed and renewed and who have come out of the lifestyle.⁴ Confronted by such evidence, and faced with the fact that his research had been discredited by scientists at a half dozen major research centers, even homosexual researcher Dean Hamer had to admit that, "There is not a single master gene that makes people gay.... I don't think we will ever be able to predict who will be gay."⁵

Simultaneously, Dr. Simon LeVay, the homosexual researcher who had studied the differences in the hypothalamus glands of homosexual and heterosexual men, had to admit that, "It's important to stress what I didn't find. I did not prove that homosexuality is genetic, or find a genetic cause for being gay. I didn't show that gay men are born that way, the most common mistake people make in interpreting my work. 1,6 I have debated Dr. LeVay on radio and television, and I've spoken with him on many occasions. While he continues to defend the homosexual agenda, he can no longer do so on the basis of science.

Even lesbian author and activist Dr. Camille Paglia dared to say that, "Homosexuality is not 'normal'. On the contrary it is a challenge to the norm.... Nature exists whether academics like it or not. And in nature, procreation is the single relentless rule. That is the norm. Our sexual bodies were designed for reproduction.... No one is born gay. The idea is ridiculous ... homosexuality is an adaptation, not an inborn trait.'⁷

WHERE DEVIANCY LEADS

One of the main reasons these confessions are important is that they help to shed light on the nature of deviant behavior and to make it clear that such practices are not built-in, and they're not innocent. Rather, they are associated with some sort of emotional disturbance in childhood, such as sexual or emotional abuse, and with premature sexual experimentation that imprints inappropriate erotic images and emotions on the minds of some young men and women.

To understand where these emotions can lead if they're not dealt with promptly and appropriately, we only need to consider briefly some of the ways that sexuality has been exploited by those with unnatural desires. There are dozens of emotional, psychological, and sociological conditions that result in bizarre sexual behaviors, and there are even groups and associations formed to promote their particular perversion.

Perhaps the best known of these is NAMBLA, the North American Man/Boy Love Association, that advocates legalized pedophilia. In addition to magazines, Web sites, chat rooms, club meetings, and other expressions of this vile perversion, NAMBLA organizes "sex tours" for its members, often to exotic third world countries or tropical islands where they can engage in unrestricted sexual intercourse with children as young as five and six years of age.

Civilized people are revolted by such things, and that's why our laws routinely condemn them and why the government actively pursues and prosecutes those who are caught participating in them. One such arrest happened recently when a well-known family dentist, Phillip Todd Calvin, age forty-three, and his two companions, David Cory Mayer, age forty-nine, and Paul Ernest Zipszer, age thirty-nine, were arrested by the FBI on San Diego's Harbor Island. The men, who were waiting for a boat to take them to Mexico, were charged with conspiracy to travel in interstate and foreign commerce for the purpose of engaging in illegal sexual conduct.

As it turns out, the whole thing was a sting operation involving the FBI, the San Diego Police Department, and other agencies involved in a nationwide crackdown on sex tourism. Informants had provided enough detailed information on the trio to make their capture possible. Fortunately, each man will face up to thirty years in prison upon conviction, but that's not the end of the problem.

When news of the operation went public, FBI spokesmen advised parents to talk frankly with their children about the possibility of being targeted by people like these three who may try to lure them into situations where they can be taken advantage of. Children who use Internet chat rooms are especially vulnerable, they said.⁸ When combined with the natural curiosity of children who have been aroused for years by sexual images in rock music, television, and the movies, the risks involved are very real. And it's not always clear whom kids can trust. In one very disturbing recent case, a minister in the city of Brea, California, was discovered to be a long-term pedophile and sexual predator.

And even if some of their members are caught in the act, NAMBLA isn't going away. The battle for gay rights has emboldened their leaders to fight the system. If same-sex marriage is ever legalized, as justice Antonin Scalia has warned, there will be nothing stopping sexual deviants from bringing every imaginable behavior out into the open, daring the law to step in. Polygamy will be the first, I suspect, since hundreds of fundamentalist

Mormons in Utah and parts of Arizona are already practicing what they call "multiple marriages;" and law enforcement is turning a blind eye. Next will come three- and four-person marriages, and groupings that would boggle the mind.

As terrible as most of us find such things as pedophilia, incest, polygamy, and bestiality to be, these are only the better known perversions that the homosexual agenda has unleashed. There are dozens of mental conditions known as paraphilias (or fetishes) that have ensnared countless victims. Among them are pederasty (male homosexuals who enjoy having sex with male children), sadomasochism (individuals who derive sexual pleasure from receiving or inflicting pain on others), and necrophilia (individuals who are sexually aroused by viewing or having sex with corpses). I hate even to name them, but unless I'm explicit about these things, some people will accuse me of exaggeration; I only wish that were the case.

BEYOND ALL MORAL LIMITS

Other perversions include such things as coprophagia (individuals who get sexual satisfaction from eating feces), klismaphilia (individuals who are sexually aroused by enemas), and even diaper fetishes (where adults get sexual pleasure from wearing diapers and wetting themselves). If the homosexual lobby's terminology is to be accepted, any one of these behaviors could be labeled as a legitimate "sexual orientation" In fact, many of the individuals who engage in these practices want their sexual behaviors to be declared normal by the counseling community.

At an American Psychiatric Association symposium in San Francisco in 2003, two psychiatrists presented a paper arguing for the legitimization of pedophilia, sadomasochism, and other similar disorders. According to an editorial in the Washington Times, psychiatrist Charles Moses and Peggy Kleinplatz, PhD, presented a paper at an APA conference titled, "DSM-IV-TR and the Paraphilias: An Argument for Removal," which argued that people with deviant sexual behaviors should not be labeled mentally ill, and that cultural and religion values are not good parameters for defining healthy sexual behavior. They said that psychiatry does not have a model that "constitutes normal and healthy sexuality to which it could compare people whose sexual interests draw them to children or sadomasochism" In other words, they said, "Any sexual interest can be healthy and life-enhancing" Fortunately, the members of the APA voted against the proposal, but the issue isn't going away.⁹

Sociologists refer to groups who engage in bizarre sexual practices as "deviant subcultures." The success of homosexuals and transgen- ders in organizing pressure groups to normalize their behaviors has emboldened these other groups to do the same. Pedophiles, as one example, have found allies in academia who support adult/child sex. In 1999, the University of

Minnesota press published Judith Levine's book *Harmful to Minors*, which argues that adult/child sex is not necessarily a bad thing. The foreword to her book, by former Surgeon General Joycelyn Elders, called on Americans to be more open-minded about sex between adults and children. Again, if homosexuals have their way, in time it will be virtually impossible to defend society from such people.

Even current Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg once argued that the age of consent for sex with or between minors should be lowered to age twelve. She has been an adamant defender of abortion, as well, and very pro-homosexual in her actions on the bench. Such thinking can only come from someone who has an affinity for the views of the homosexual lobby and, particularly in Ginsburg's case, from her former role as general counsel of the ACLU.

In an article assessing the new trend called "Pedophilia Chic;" Dr. Mary Eberstadt described for readers of the *Weekly Standard* the close relationships between the homosexual community and the growing pedophile movement. Eberstadt says the reason why sex with boys is being so openly debated in this country today is because it's being pushed by "certain parts of the gay rights movement. The more that movement has entered the mainstream, the more this 'question' has bubbled forth from that previously distant realm into the public square."¹⁰ All these evils spring from the same root.

According to one homosexual writer, the term "domestic partnerships" was first used in California in 1989. The idea was slow in catching on and resulted in few tangible benefits. Same-sex partners wanted hospital visitation rights, which they got, then certain businesses and public organizations began offering domestic-partner benefits to their employees. Eventually, however, homosexuals in the state legislature began talking about marriage benefits, civil unions, and same-sex marriage. By the time Mayor Gavin Newsom handed three thousand marriage licenses to homosexuals in San Francisco, the way had been paved. The debates over same-sex marriage taking place today are part of the same strategy that began there, then migrated to Hawaii in 1993, Vermont in 1999, Massachusetts in 2003, and Connecticut in 2005.

And it's not over yet.

What's happening is a process the homosexual community calls "incrementalism" It's a process of gradual desensitization and familiarization, breaking down the natural resistance of the public to what's actually involved in homosexual relationships. And it's also a way of blackmailing legislators and other public officials into making largescale concessions to the gay rights movement, which has managed to persuade many people that homosexuality is a "civil right"

The position of the Traditional Values Coalition is that same-sex marriage,

domestic partnerships, civil unions, and every other synonym used to describe the union of two individuals of the same sex in some sort of counterfeit marriage must remain illegal and unacceptable in this country. I am fighting now in the halls of Congress for a constitutional amendment, as I've described earlier, to insure that marriage is defined as the legal union of one man and one woman. But we will only support a constitutional amendment that fully protects marriage with no civil unions or any other arrangement that allows homosexuals to marry. Marriage is a God-ordained institution that preexisted the founding of this nation, and the sanctity of marriage and the family must be protected and preserved by law.

A WAY OF ESCAPE

Dr. Warren Throckmorton is an expert in the study and treatment of homosexuality. He is someone who believes that there are ways to escape from these debilitating social and emotional illnesses. In the film he produced, called *I Do Exist*, Dr. Throckmorton gives us a glimpse into the lives of five former homosexuals who have found their way back to emotional and sexual health. In the film he also answers many questions about the prospects for change.

Designed as a documentary, the film describes how people come to identify themselves as gay in the first place, and then how they are able to transition to a new life as heterosexuals. This is just one of the resources I recommend to people who want a clearer picture of what happens to people in this lifestyle and how some brave individuals manage to break away. The men and women who tell their stories in this film describe the process of reorienting their sexual desires and behaviors by developing a sense of self-awareness and finding a renewed sense of satisfaction in their lives.

The most compelling component of this film is the story of Noe Gutierrez, who had been interviewed in the pro-homosexual film *It's Elementary* years earlier when he was in middle school. Today he is heterosexual, and looking back on that experience now with a new frame of reference, Gutierrez regrets having contributed to a documentary that aggressively pointed kids toward homosexual experimentation, telling them that if they feel different in some way, they may be gay. Along with personal and professional commentary from a group of distinguished scientists and researchers, *I Do Exist* makes it clear that change is possible, and that homosexuals who are determined to find a better way can actually escape the lifestyle and the death sentence it brings.¹¹

This is also a message that people like Diane Mattingly and Michael Lumberger are now sharing with audiences around the country. Diane is a former lesbian who grew up in a home where all the love and attention of both parents were directed at her older brother. The brother was handsome, a popular athlete, and a good student. "It is said that children are the best

recorders, but the worst interpreters, of information;" Diane says. "I interpreted this favoritism to mean that my brother-and not me-was the one who was supposed to succeed. As I watched my parents pour their hopes and dreams into him, I felt like I was on the sidelines"¹²

There are many twists and turns in Diane's story, and many times when she felt cut off and unloved. Psychologist Mary Beth Patton, who works with the Portland affiliate of Exodus International, writes that, "Women who deal with same-sex attraction often possess a history of dis-identification with their mothers, and therefore their femininity. This leads to a longing for connection with the feminine that becomes sexualized in adolescence" Reading those words today, Diane recognizes that this is what happened to her. Without the love or respect of either parent, she began looking for love in all the wrong places, and she found it.

Between her long- and short-term relationships with other women, Diane dated men and even became pregnant by one of them. She imagined momentarily that this might be the answer to her hunger, but the father of her child wanted none of it, left her alone, and she took the easy way out by aborting her baby. After many dark nights of soul searching and bouts of bitter agony and self-hatred, Diane finally called out to God for help, and she found her way to two organizations in her home state of Virginia that had the answers she needed.

"The most I could ever hope to do in my own strength," Diane says today, "was to keep myself walled off from further hurt. Left to my own efforts, I would have had to settle for existing instead of living. And I wanted to live." Diane had no choice but to trust God for healing. He had begun a process in her that made sense, at last, and she made the difficult choice of walking away from her old life of sorrow in order to find a better life in Christ. "I've had to choose to keep myself present to the larger body of Christ;" she says, "and be willing to enter into transparent relationships with people. Healing comes in community and by being in fellowship with other believers. Isolation is one of the greatest enemies of the soul."

When Diane entered a program of counseling and participation called Living Waters, run by Regeneration of Northern Virginia, which is part of Exodus International, a ministry to ex-gays, her restoration began. "I have put off the labels of victim and lesbian and betrayed;" she says. "I have had to be willing to let God define me as a woman and to show me how to be comfortable with my true femininity."¹³

A TRIAL BY FIRE

For Michael Lumberger, the road to homosexuality was initiated by sexual abuse by an older sibling when he was just four years of age. Because of threats of violence, the boy kept quiet, and the abuse continued. By the time

he reached junior high school and the onset of puberty, Michael felt "different" His parents were cold and unexpressive. There was no hugging or touching in the home, so his natural desire for affection drew him to other boys since this was the only closeness he had ever known.

When Michael moved away to go to college, he shared a room with two other young men, one of whom was homosexual. During the first two years there, he says, he had sex with men and women. He was a young African American male, well liked, and he knew the ropes. It was only when a classmate discovered that Michael had been having sex with his male roommate that his lifestyle suddenly took on a much more dramatic dimension. "Of course, I denied everything," he said, "but inside I was already running. Within a week I had packed my bags and left college. I was terrified that people would find out what I had been doing in secret. I went back home and worked with my family for a few months. Then I decided, if I'm gay, I'm going to be gay all the way." And that's where his slide into the homosexual lifestyle began.

"When I ran out of money for food and drugs," he said, "I even learned to sell my body on the streets. But after a few months, I grew sick of homosexuality." Eventually Michael went home and got a real job. In time he met a woman he cared for, and they got married and had three children. But his head and his heart were still confused, and before long he'd lost all those signs of a normal life. When he fell back into his old habits, his wife left him and took the children. In the depths of despair, he said, God must have heard his silent cry for help. He found his way to one church that provided some of the answers for his questions, but, because of secret sin in the lives of certain members of the church, he almost fell back into his old lifestyle.

Wisely, Michael moved to a new church that taught the true Word of God. Again, God heard his prayers and spoke to his heart, saying, "This is the church where I will deliver you from homosexuality" As that process began, he once again heard the silent prompting in his spirit, and, once again, he was attracted to a woman who appealed to him, but he was uncertain until one day he felt the Lord say to him, "That woman is going to be your wife" He trusted that voice, introduced himself to the woman he had admired from afar, and nine months later they were married.

Michael's healing from a life of homosexuality and identity confusion wasn't immediate. He struggled with sin and at one point was diagnosed with full-blown AIDS. That news changed everything. He spent a lonely vigil one night with a former homosexual partner who died in his arms, and in his tears and confusion, Michael begged God to cleanse him and put him on the road to freedom. Once again, the voice of reassurance told him that all would be well.

"Several weeks later," Michael says, "my pastor asked me to begin leading the support group when the previous leader resigned. When I prayed about

the decision, God said to me, 'This is the thing that I have been preparing you for.' In the years since then," he adds, "about five hundred to six hundred men and women have gone through the group. Some of them have gone back into gay life, but a great majority of them are church leaders today. Some are married with families. And it has all happened because I said yes to what God called me to do:" And most surprising of all, Michael said, today he is "totally free from the AIDS virus."¹⁴

CONSCIENTIOUS INTERVENTION NEEDED

The homosexual lifestyle, as these stories reveal, is a sad and torturous affair. At best, homosexuals are coping with deep pain, anxiety, and insecurity. Their attempts at finding love and acceptance are almost always futile, and the horrors of disease and disability they endure as a direct result of their unnatural habits are sad and terrible. There is nothing attractive about a lesbian who has eradicated her femininity in order to become a pseudo-male. There's nothing winsome about a twenty-three-year-old homosexual with a colostomy bag at his side.

The lifestyle is murderous, and the condemnation of Scripture is clear. But it's also important to point out, as I want to do now, that we must not react so quickly or so self-righteously to the homosexual agenda that we end up hating not just the sin but the sinner as well. Jesus taught that we are to rebuke the sinner, but we are also to forgive him if he earnestly repents and turns from his sin. Jesus said, "Take heed to yourselves. If your brother sins against you, rebuke him; and if he repents, forgive him" (Luke 17:3, NKJv). Yes, he maybe weak; he may even fall back and repeat his sin, as Peter discovered; but if he genuinely repents, we are told, we are to forgive the sin. And that's a part of our mission of recovery and restoration, too.

In my ministry with the Traditional Values Coalition in Washington DC, dealing with Congress and many government and nongovernmental organizations on important issues of ethics and morality, I have often had a close working relationship with people on the other side of these issues. In one case, it was a former Republican congressman who came out of the closet. In other cases I've worked with members of Congress who saw these problems much differently but who were nevertheless willing to discuss and debate them with me.

It's important to know that we don't need to hate our opponents, and you can even have a friendship with some of them, as I have done. The point is to try to find common ground so that constructive change can be made. Furthermore, we need to share the gospel even as we stand against the forces of darkness, for Christ is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance (2 Pet. 3:9). We need to make sure that we give all who will listen to this admonition the opportunity to experience the life-changing redemption of Christ's love.

The best way to head off the homosexual agenda before it gets any worse is to make sure we have an ounce of prevention in the public arena—especially in the public schools. That is, to make sure that children have mothers and fathers who are good role models. We must uphold the standards of stable, two-parent families, and not lower them. Education in the public schools is, as we know, a very dangerous area, as the NEA and others try to implement a value-neutral moral climate. Parents, churches, and community leaders need to be sensitive to every child and the attitudes and values they are exposed to.

We need to show particular concern for those who do not have a father in the home or who do not have suitable role models. That should be a ministry for the churches: to create an atmosphere where every child can feel the security of an adult male who is not sexually motivated but who cares about the emotional health of the child. And we need to be involved in places where dramatic changes are taking place. Certainly the homosexual debate is an area where responsible, well-informed, and conscientious intervention is needed. And there's so much to be done.

CONQUERING OUR FEARS

I'm convinced that our biggest problem today is that a spirit of timidity has silenced the prophetic voice of the church. Paul assures us that, "God has not given us a spirit of fear, but of power and of love and of a sound mind" And he adds, "Therefore do not be ashamed of the testimony of our Lord, nor of me His prisoner, but share with me in the sufferings for the gospel according to the power of God" (2 Tim. 1:7-8, NKJV).

Just as a physician cannot look away from the sick and injured patient, we cannot look away from the man or woman who is trapped in homosexual sin. To be faithful to our challenge, we need to help our Christian men to get past the point where homosexuality is repulsive to them. What the gay movement calls homophobia is, in reality, the natural response of the male ego to behaviors that are inherently repulsive to us. But when we understand the social disorder of the homosexual and the circumstances that may have led to that lifestyle, then our compassion has to be directed at helping them find their way out of darkness.

We have to be able to talk about homosexuality in a very clinical manner. We have to be able to describe what and why it is, and to be very clear and direct in saying that these practices are, by God's design, harmful and potentially fatal activities. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention calls them "high-risk behaviors;" and that's exactly what they are. Many young boys who run away from home for no other reason than rebellion end up finding a man who will father them with a certain amount of freedom where they can do what they want, and they end up in a homosexual relationship. It's not that they wanted to be homosexual, but that's where

their rebellion led them. And many girls get into prostitution in much the same way.

It's tragic to see them lined up on the streets of Los Angeles, Greenwich Village, or Las Vegas—male and female prostitutes sometimes no more than fourteen or fifteen years of age. The only reason they're prostitutes in many cases is because they couldn't make enough money any other way. But it's equally true that many of them will be dead before they ever reach adulthood, either from disease, from accidents, or from violent crime.

Unfortunately, many men are verbally paralyzed for fear of speaking about these problems. Women don't have quite the same reaction to homosexuals that most men have, for a very simple reason. Pregnancy and childbirth are natural experiences in the context of marriage and family, and for most women this is neither strange nor troublesome. Men, however, often find themselves in the role of mystified observers who can only look on with awe and admiration. By the same token, when a woman encounters a homosexual in the workplace, she feels secure in her own sexuality, while most men are very uncomfortable in this situation. Men have to learn how to recognize what they feel and to express verbally why homosexuality is wrong.

We need to speak, early and often, of the high price to our society if we remain blind and mute about what's happening to this nation. If we are silent, and if we decide not to learn and to speak out with righteous indignation, then it will be our children, their friends, and the entire next generation of American society that will be destroyed by it. This is what J. D. Unwin says in his book. If a single generation refuses to enforce and hold up in a high and honorable way the principles of monogamy in marriage, and no extramarital sex, then the next generation will be submerged in promiscuity and sexual license, and that's when society loses its cultural energy.

A TIME FOR ACTION

Some sociologists have suggested that if anything is deeply morally and culturally wrong in society, it will eventually become clear to everyone and changes will be made. We will say that slavery was a profound cultural wrong, which, thanks to men like William Wilberforce in England and the abolitionists in America, was eventually reversed. Our policies and laws were changed, and our attitudes about the evil practice of slavery were radically altered, but not before thousands of lives were lost and not until we had endured a tragic civil war in this country that spilled precious blood on both sides of the Mason-Dixon line.

Sometimes societies do make changes of this magnitude, but it may take generations for that to happen. If government passes a bad law and no one

reacts to stop it, it may eventually destroy itself and destroy the people it was meant to help. The public may eventually come to their senses and repeal a bad law, but when a basic moral law is transgressed, there may be thousands or even millions of lives lost before the citizens wake up and turn back to a higher moral standard. I'm convinced that our society will one day be forced to recognize and admit that homosexuality was a terrible and tragic wrong, but are we willing to wait until another generation is lost? Can we go any further in the wrong direction before we take action to stop it?

We can't wait, and I for one am not prepared to watch the slow devastation of this great nation in such a manner. The Book of Genesis tells us that God's creative order was perfect in the beginning. In Genesis 1:26 we read that God made man in His own image. In Genesis 2:18 we see that God saw that it was not good for man to be alone without a female. So He says, "I will make a helper comparable to him" Then you have the Creation story repeated in more detail.

If you read on to chapter 11 and God's calling of Abraham, you will see that Abraham is brought by God out of Ur of the Chaldees, which is modern Iraq. And that ancient society was absolutely saturated, not with the nuclear family, but with promiscuity and every kind of sexual vice. Homosexuality was rampant, and infant sacrifices were common. So God called Abraham out of that setting and told him, "You will be the father of many nations"

That was God's plan. It was His creative order. But, of course, Abraham messed up before he became fully obedient. He conceived a child with Hagar, the maidservant of his wife Sarah, and he created a generation of people who today are very much at odds with everything that has to do with Jesus Christ and the Christian gospel. But when Abraham got things back on track, God forgave him, and the rest is history. But here's the point. God did not want to bring forth a nation in a setting that was saturated with sexual perversion and homosexuality. So there was this little monogamous, heterosexual tribe, moving around Mesopotamia, in an area that was submersed in pedophilia, bisexuality, and every sort of immorality. And God brought them out.

WE SHALL PREVAIL!

As I've said in many places in this book, the Founding Fathers believed that America was a special nation, a chosen people, a shining city on a hill. Some called it the New Jerusalem, and they believed America was to be a civilization built on that epic model of Israel, as Abraham saw it. It doesn't matter whether you're a Jew, a Muslim, or a Christian today: This is the premise upon which our republic was founded. This was the model on which our culture has been built. It is a covenant with God, and that's why it's so clear that fornication and adultery and homosexuality and all the ills that have been cited in these pages are so absolutely contrary to God's plan

of order and happiness for mankind.

We need to remember Benjamin Franklin's words to that woman in the crowd when he was leaving the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1789. She asked, "Doctor, what have you given us?" To which the old gentleman replied, "A republic, if you can keep it"¹⁵ That challenge still stands. But with these images in view, I would ask you to consider the contrasting portrait of where we actually stand today, threatened not only by extremists on the outside but by radical activists in our midst.

Make no mistake; the homosexual agenda is a strategic plan for war. It is not a public policy briefing or a marketing plan: the agenda that has been disseminated by the homosexual lobby is a military strategy, a campaign map for a war to the death, waged by cunning men upon a supine and self-indulgent nation. The media and the cultural elites have already given up. The children in our schools and colleges are being turned against us even now. To overcome this fearsome campaign, we will need sovereign guidance and nerves of steel. The stakes could not be higher, but we have a benevolent Defender and Friend on our side.

I do not exaggerate when I say that this trial by fire will determine the very survival of our culture and the fate of civilization as we know it. This is not a battle against foreign enemies or third world extremists, but against an even greater foe: the forces of darkness and legions of angry homosexuals and lesbians determined to abolish Christian virtue and moral judgment in any form. We must proceed with caution, and we must come forth with open hands.

We must hear this message in our churches. The battle can be won, but only if we work together to push back the darkness of ignorance, apathy, and compromise. Now that we have a better understanding of what the agenda is all about, we must continue sounding the alarm until the entire Christian community is awake and fully engaged. We cannot rest until this battle is won, but with God's help, we shall prevail!

NOTES

[Due to the age of web links, you can try searching for archived snapshots of pages & docs no longer available at <https://archive.org/web/>]

INTRODUCTION - WANTED: A FAITHFUL WITNESS

1. Matthew D. Stayer, *Same-Sex Marriage: Putting Every Household at Risk* (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2004), 102.
2. J. W. Curran, et al., "Epidemiology of HIV Infection and AIDS in the United States;" *Science* 239 (February 5, 1988): 610-616.
3. W. Odets, in a report to the American Association of Physicians for Human Rights, cited in E. L. Goldman, "Psychological Factors Generate HIV Resurgence in Young Gay Men," *Clinical Psychiatry News* (October 1994): 5.
4. B. A. Koblin, et al., "Increased Incidence of Cancer Among Homosexual Men, New York City and San Francisco 1978-1990;" *American Journal of Epidemiology* (November 1996): 916-923.
5. J. M. Palefsky, et al., "Anal Squamous Intraepithelial Lesions in HIV-Positive and HIV-Negative Homosexual and Bisexual Men: Prevalence and Risk Factors," *Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes* (April 1998): 320-326.
6. Goldman, "Psychological Factors Generate HIV Resurgence in Young Gay Men."
7. Paul Cameron, PhD, William L. Playfair, MD, and Stephen Wellum, "The Longevity of Homosexuals: Before and After the AIDS Epidemic," *Omega: The Journal of Death and Dying* 29 (1994): 3, quoted in Dr. D. James Kennedy, "Homosexuality," *Today's Conflict, Tomorrow's Crisis*, copyright 2001, <http://www.eaglescourtally.org/conflict-crisis.htm> (accessed April 14, 2005).
8. David Island and Patrick Letellier, *Men Who Beat the Men Who Love Them* (New York: Haworth Press, 1991), 14.
9. Alan P. Bell and Martin S. Weinberg, *Homosexualities: A Study of Diversity Among Men and Women* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1979). See also: A. Bell, M. Weinberg, and S. Hammersmith, *Sexual Preference: Its Development in Men and Women* (Bloomington, IL: Indiana University Press, 1981).

10. Paul Cameron and Kirk Cameron, "What Is 'A Homosexual,'" Journal of the Family Research Institute 15 (June/July 2000), http://www.familyresearchinstitute.org/RR_00_07.html (accessed April 14, 2005).
11. "NEA Pres Bob Chase's Historic Speech From 2000 GLSEN Conference," October 7, 2000, <http://www.glsen.org/cgi-bin/iowa/all/news/record/143.html> (accessed April 12, 2005).
12. Frank York, "Brave New Schools: Public Employees Teach Kids 'Gay' Sex," WorldNetDaily, May 9, 2000, http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=17490 (accessed April 12, 2005).
13. Douglas Montero, "Secret Shame of Our Schools: Sexual Abuse of Students Runs Rampant," New York Post, July 30, 2001.
14. "Prepared Statement of Daniel E. Troy, Esquire, Associate Scholar, American Enterprise Institute, and Partner, Wiley, Rein and Fielding," Hate Crimes Violence, hearing before the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, 106th Congress, August 4, 1999, 70-88, http://commdocs.house.gov/committees/judiciary/hju62909.000/hju62909_of.htm (accessed April 12, 2005).
15. CNN.com Election 2004, Ballot Measures, <http://www.cnn.com/ELECTION/2004/pages/results/ballot.measures/> (accessed April 12, 2005).

CHAPTER 1 - DESTRUCTIVE FORCES

1. Connie Marshner, "We Told You So: The Homosexual Network, 20 Years Later," Free Congress Foundation, February 8, 2002.
2. James Davison Hunter, Culture Wars: The Struggle to Define America (New York: Basic Books, 1991).
3. Jon Ward, "Atheist Sues to Ban Hand on Bible," Washington Times, January 8, 2005, <http://www.washtimes.com/metro/20050108-120519-9586r.htm> (accessed April 12, 2005).
4. See especially: Robert A. J. Gagnon, The Bible and Homosexual Practice: Texts and Hermeneutics (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2001).
5. Joanne Laucus, "Bible: Decision Raises Questions About Freedom of Speech," Ottawa Citizen, June 29, 2001, article accessed at Secular News Headlines, <http://www.eunacom.net/SecularNews.htm> (accessed April 12, 2005). See also, "A Canadian Civil Rights Ruling Dealing With Anti-Gay Verses in the Bible," http://www.religioustolerance.org/bibl_hate3.htm (accessed March 28, 2005).
6. "Teacher to Be Suspended One Month Without Pay for Writing Against

Homosexual Agenda in Schools," Vancouver, April 16, 2003, <http://www.lifesitenews.com>, <http://www.lifesite.net/ldn/2003/apr/03041603.html> (accessed March 28, 2005).

7. David Ottewell, "Gay-row Bishop Not to Face 'Hate' Charge," Manchester News, Manchester Online, November 11, 2003, http://www.manchesteronline.co.uk/news/s/72/72632_gayrow_bishop_not_to_face_hate_charge.html (accessed April 13, 2005).
8. R. Albert Mohler Jr., "Criminalizing Christianity: Sweden's Hate Speech Law," Alex Jones' <http://www.prisonplanet.com>, August 6, 2004, <http://www.prisonplanet.com/articles/august2004/060804criminalizingchristianity.htm> (accessed April 13, 2005).
9. "Belgian Cardinal to Be Sued for Remarks on Homosexuality," January 26, 2004, <http://www.cwnews.com/news/viewstory.cfm?recnum=27229> (accessed April 13, 2005).
10. "Gay Marriages Issue Sparks Row in Spain," GMax News, January 6, 2004, <http://www.gmax.co.za/look04/01/06-spainmarry.html> (accessed April 13, 2005).
11. The goal of the "gay agenda" is spelled out in lurid detail in Marshall Kirk and Hunter Madsen, *After the Ball: How America Will Conquer Its Fear and Hatred of Gays in the 90s* (New York: Plume, 1990), 146-147. This is also discussed further in this chapter.
12. Jimmy Breslin, "This Holy Week's a Big, Unholy Mess," *Newsday*, April 7, 2004, <http://pqasb.pqarchiver.com/newsday/doc/279782534.html?FMT=FT&FMTS=ABS:FT&type=current&date=&author=&pub=&desc=This+Holy+Week%27s+a+big%2C+unholy+mess> (accessed April 13, 2005).
13. Associated Press, "Newsday Prints Editor's Note on Breslin," Editor & Publisher, April 15, 2004, http://www.mediainfo.com/eandp/news/article_display.jsp?vnu_content_id=1000489327 (accessed April 13, 2005).
14. Ibid.
15. Lionel Wright, "The Stonewall Riots-1969," *Socialism Today* 40 (July 1999).
16. Norman Markowitz, "Harry Hay: The Great Forerunner," [PoliticalAffairs.net](http://www.politicalaffairs.net), Archives-Dates and Topics / 2004 / April, <http://www.politicalaffairs.net/article/view/119/1/29> (accessed April 13, 2005).
17. At one point Frank Kameny also tried to take the name Traditional Values Coalition away from our organization, which prompted us to register the name as a trademark with the United States Patent Office to make certain that neither Kameny nor any other group could misuse our name or mislead the public about their agenda.

18. Daniel C. Palm and Tom Krannawitter, "L.A. County's Seal and the Real Agenda of the ACLU," Claremont Institute, June 9, 2004, http://www.claremont.org/writings/040609palm_kran.html (accessed April 13, 2005).
19. Charles Socarides, MD, "The Sexual Deviations and the Diagnostic Manual," *American Journal of Psychotherapy* (July 1978).
20. Ronald Bayer, *Homosexuality and American Psychiatry: The Politics of Diagnosis* (New York: Basic Books, 1981), 101-154; William Dannemeyer, *Shadow in the Land* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1989), 24-39.
21. Brian Clowes and Steve Frezza, "Homosexuality and the 'Ten Percent' Myth," *The Pro-Life Activist's Encyclopedia* (Stafford, VA: American Life League, 1998), chapter 116, <http://prolife.ath.cx:8000/plae116.htm> (accessed April 13, 2005).
22. Ibid.
23. Charles W. Socarides, MD, "How America Went Gay," *America* (November 18, 1995), quoted on <http://www.leaderu.com/jhs/socarides.html> (accessed March 31, 2005).
24. Kirk and Madsen, *After the Ball*, quoted in Socarides, "How America Went Gay."
25. Ibid.
26. According to federal regulations, as applied by the federal courts and agencies such as the Equal Opportunity Employment Commission (EEOC), legal minority status is determined upon evidence of being uniquely deprived of cultural advantages by virtue of race, religion, physical disability, or other unique criteria. To meet the legal definition of a "discreet and insular minority" under U.S. law, individuals and groups of individuals must be socially, vocationally, economically and educationally disadvantaged, and must be clearly identified as individuals who have been faced with restrictions and limitations, subjected to a history of purposeful unequal treatment, and relegated to a position of political powerlessness in our society. By none of these criteria do homosexuals qualify for minority status. Economically, educationally, socially, and culturally, homosexuals are above the national average and come from all segments of society. Clearly, their push for "minority" status is a political ploy with no basis in fact. For example, see *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke*, 438 U.S. 265 (1978).
27. A fuller discussion of these issues follows in chapter ten.
28. General Colin Powell, Chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, letter to Congresswoman Pat Schroeder as quoted in the *Salem Statesman Journal*, June 6, 1992.

29. J. D. Unwin, *Sex and Culture* (London: Oxford University Press, H. Milford), 1934.
30. William J. Bennett, *The Broken Hearth: Reversing the Moral Collapse of the American Family* (New York: Doubleday, 2001).
31. For a devastating analysis of the sexual confusion rampant among adolescents today, see a report of the pro-homosexual Sexuality Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS): April/May 2001, vol. 29, no. 4 [http://www.thebody.com/siecus/report/youth_issues.html]. This statistical review indicates just how effective, and how tragic, two decades of pro-homosexual indoctrination in the nation's classrooms has been in eroding sexual morality among children. This report draws on statistics from the Minnesota study by E. M. Saewyc, L. H. Bearinger, R. W. Blum, and M. D. Resnick, "Sexual Intercourse, Abuse and Pregnancy Among Adolescent Women: Does Sexual Orientation Make a Difference?," *Family Planning Perspectives* 31 (May/June 1999): 127-131.

CHAPTER 2 - A CAMPAIGN OF DECEPTION

1. Marshall Kirk and Erastes Pill, "The Overhauling of Straight America," *Guide Magazine*, November 1987. Note also that Erastes Pill is a pseudonym of Harvard sociologist Hunter Madsen, who coauthored the book *After the Ball*, cited earlier.
2. Gagnon, *The Bible and Homosexual Practice: Texts and Hermeneutics*, 37.
3. Ibid.
4. In a volume on female sexuality Kinsey makes the statement, "It is difficult to understand why a child, except for its cultural conditioning, should be disturbed at having its genitalia touched" Furthermore, Dr. Judith Reisman, who has conducted the most exhaustive analysis of Kinsey and his fraudulent claims, writes that during a conference hosted by the British Psychological Association, "an old colleague of Dr. Alfred Kinsey... whispered confidentially to me that Kinsey was a pedophile" Although Dr. Reisman was surprised by this admission, she was able to corroborate the man's assertion as well as Kinsey's link to the group Academic Pedophile Advocates. See Judith Reisman, "The APAs: Academic Pedophile Advocates;" *WorldNetDaily*, March 26, 1999, http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=16094 (accessed April 15, 2005).
5. E. Michael Jones, "The Case Against Kinsey," *Fidelity Magazine*, April 1989, 22-35, cited in the *Pro-Life Activist's Encyclopedia*.
6. As I reported in our "Talking Points" memo (Vol. 1, No. 2a), the liberal Alan Guttmacher Institute reported in *Family Planning Perspectives* (March/April

1993) that less than 2 percent of males had experienced a homosexual relationship in the past ten years, and only 1 percent had exclusively homosexual relationships. Similarly, the Nation Research Corporation (NORC) Survey at the University of Chicago reported a mere 0.7 percent as having exclusively homosexual relationships and 2.2 percent having had a homosexual relationship in the previous 10 years. Adding to the weight of evidence is a United States Census Bureau report showing that less than 2 percent of men reported even incidental homosexual behavior. And the Morton-Hunt Study (commissioned for Playboy magazine) found that about 1 percent of males and one-half of 1 percent of females are homosexual.

7. Gershon Legman, *The Horn Book: Studies in Erotic Folklore and Bibliography* (New Hyde Park, New York: University Books, 1964).
8. Jones, "The Case Against Kinsey"
9. Judith A. Reisman, et al., *Kinsey, Sex, and Fraud: The Indoctrination of a People-An Investigation Into the Human Sexuality Research of Alfred C. Kinsey*, Wardell B. Pomeroy, Clyde E. Martin, and Paul H. Gebhard (Lafayette, LA: Huntington House Publishers, 1990).
10. In an address to members of the National Lesbian and Gay Journalism Association (NLGJA) at the National Press Club, April 12, 2000, Richard Berke, a national political correspondent for the New York Times, said, "This is at a newspaper where not so long ago-when I started there 15 years ago-they were keeping lists-the department heads were asking for lists of the gay reporters on different sections so they could be punished in different ways. So things have really changed at the newspaper. Since I've been there, there's been a dramatic shift: I remember coming and wondering if there were ... any gay reporters there or whatever. Now it's like, there are times when you look at the front-page meeting and... literally three-quarters of the people deciding what's on the front page are not-so-closeted homosexuals..." NLGJA's "View from the Top" Reception was sponsored by America Online, USA Today, Washington Post, and CBS News. Reported in "Just How 'Gay' Is the New York Times?" in the April-May 2000 issue of *The Lambda Report*. [Source: Washington Times, July 28, 2000, A2. See also: WorldNetDaily.com, "The New York Times' Homosexual Culture," October 1, 2004, http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=40708 (accessed April 18, 2005).]
11. J. Edward Pawlick, *Libel by the New York Times* (Holliston, MA: Mustard Seeds Publishing, 2003).
12. Ibid.
13. "Inside Homosexual Journalists' Conference," WorldNetDaily .com, September 13, 2000, http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=17633 (accessed April 18, 2005).

14. Joseph Farah, "Between the Lines: Activist-Journalists Out of the Closet," WorldNetDaily.com, September 13, 2000, http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=15046 (accessed April 18, 2005).
15. Ibid.
16. "Inside Homosexual Journalists' Conference"
17. Bert Dawes, compiler, "Story! Story! Story! Walt Disney Speaks," SaveDisney.com, <http://www.savedisney.com/news/essays/bd043004.1.asp> (accessed April 5, 2005).
18. William F. Jasper, "Morality Meltdown," New American 19, June 2, 2003, http://www.thenewamerican.com/tna/2003/06-02-2003/vol19no11_morality.htm (accessed April 5, 2005).
19. "Disney Comes Out of the Closet," Buzz magazine, May 1995, quoted in Disney Boycott, <http://www.geocities.com/Heartland/7547/disney.html> (accessed April 5, 2005).
20. Ed Vitagliano, "Disney Execs in Collusion With Homosexual Rights Activists," AFA Journal, August 12, 1997.
21. Sean Griffin, Tinker Belles and Evil Queens: The Walt Disney Company From the Inside Out (New York: New York University Press, 2000).
22. Marshall K. Kirk and Erastus Pill, "The Overhauling of Straight America: Waging Peace, Part II," Guide Magazine, November 1987, http://www.abiditruth.com/_docs/resources/8142838.pdf (accessed April 5, 2005).
23. Ibid.
24. Ibid.
25. Cited in Tony Marco, "'Gay Rights' Strategies Involve Conscious Deception and Wholesale Manipulation of Public Opinion," Special Class Protections for Self-Alleged Gays: A Question of "Orientation" and Consequences: A Public Policy Analysis, <http://www.leaderu.com/marco/special/spc15.html> (accessed April 19, 2005).
26. Eric M. Pollard, "Time to Give Up Fascist Tactics," Washington Blade, January 31, 1992, 39.
27. Ibid.
28. Ibid.
29. Adolf Hitler, Mein Kampf [My Struggle], translated by the British Foreign Policy Association, 1935, cited in Marco, "'Gay Rights' Strategies Involve

30. A. P. Bell, "Homosexualities: Their Range and Character," Paper in Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, J. K. Cole and R. Dienstbier, editor (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1973). Paul Cameron, "What Causes Homosexuality?" (Lincoln, NE: Institute for the Scientific Study of Sexuality (ISIS), 1984. Table from the Pro-Life Activist's Encyclopedia.

CHAPTER 3 - A PUBLIC HEALTH DISASTER

1. Timothy J. Dailey, PhD, "The Negative Health Effects of Homosexuality;" Insight 232, March 21, 2001, <http://www.frc.org/get.cfm?i=ISO1B1> (accessed April 19, 2005).
2. Paul Cameron, William J. Playfair, and Stephen Wellum, "The Homosexual Life Span," Family Research Institute, Inc. Washington DC, 1992-1993, <http://www.frc.org/insight/is93g2hs.html>.
3. Elizabeth Arias, PhD, "United States Life Tables, 2000," National Vital Statistics Reports, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, December 19, 2002. See Abstract, page 1.
4. Robert S. Hogg, et al., "Modeling the Impact of HIV Disease on Mortality in Gay and Bisexual Men," International Journal of Epidemiology 26 (1997): 657, cited by Daily, "The Negative Health Effects of Homosexuality."
5. Ibid.
6. Cameron, Playfair, and Wellum, "The Longevity of Homosexuals: Before and After the AIDS Epidemic," 249ff.
7. Bell and Weinberg, Homosexualities: A Study of Diversity Among Men and Women.
8. Cameron, Playfair, and Wellum, "The Homosexual Life Span." See also: Paul Gebhard and Alan B. Johnson, The Kinsey Data: Marginal Tabulations of the 1938-1963 Interviews Conducted by the Institute for Sex Research (Philadelphia: Saunders, 1979).
9. The United Nations Report, UNAIDS, estimates 5.3 million new HIV infections occurred in 2000. This represents almost 16,000 new cases per day. An estimated 3.0 million adults and children died of HIV/AIDS in 2000. For more detail, see the CDC HIV/AIDS Surveillance Report and the UNAIDS AIDS Epidemic Update. For a statistical report of the global incidence of AIDS and HIV, go to Family Practice Notebook online at <http://www.fpnotebook.com/HIV11.htm>.
10. Lionel Wright, "The Stonewall Riots-1969," <http://www.socialistalternative.c>

om/literature/stonewall.html (accessed April 5, 2005).

11. Simon LeVay, *The Sexual Brain* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1993).
12. "Cases of HIV Infection and Aids in the United States, 2002;" HIV/AIDS Surveillance Report 14 (2002), Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, quoted in "HIV/AIDS Statistics;" Facts and Figures, National Institutes of Health, <http://www.niaid.nih.gov/factsheets/aidsstat.htm> (accessed April 19, 2005).
13. Paul Cameron, "The High Cost of Sodomy: Part I;" in *Journal of the Family Research Institute* 19 (March 2004): http://www.familyresearchinst.org/FR_R_04_03.html (accessed April 19, 2005).
14. "HIV and AIDS-United States, 1981-2001," *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report (MMWR)* 50 (2001): 430-434, quoted in "HIV/AIDS Statistics," Facts and Figures, National Institutes of Health, <http://www.niaid.nih.gov/factsheets/aidsstat.htm> (accessed April 19, 2005).
15. Jennifer Oldham, "The Economic Cost of AIDS," *Los Angeles Times*, October 13, 1995, D1.
16. Bell and Weinberg, *Homosexualities: A Study of Diversity Among Men and Women*.
17. American Medical Association (AMA), *American Adolescents: How Healthy Are They?* (1990), 31.
18. Mireya Navarro, "Federal Officials See Sharp Rise of Hepatitis Among Gay Men," *New York Times*, March 6, 1992.
19. "Background Information," report by John Li, MD, for ThinkQuest Library, 1996, <http://library.thinkquest.org/10631/PHYSICIAN/backgrou.htm> (accessed April 20, 2005).
20. Oldham, "The Economic Cost of AIDS."
21. "AIDS-Infected Patients Cost Hospitals Up to \$260,000 Per Year, Study Says," *Baltimore Sun*, June 1, 1995, 16A.
22. Peter V. Chin-Hong, et al., "Age-Specific Prevalence of Anal Human Papillomavirus Infection in HIV-Negative Sexually Active Men Who Have Sex With Men: The EXPLORE Study," *Journal of Infectious Diseases* 190 (December 15, 2004): 2070-2076, http://www.natap.org/2004/HIV/120804_OI.htm (accessed April 20, 2005). And the related earlier study: J. M. Palefsky, et al., "Prevalence and Risk Factors for Human Papillomavirus Infection of the Anal Canal in Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) Positive and HIV Negative Homosexual Men," *Journal of Infectious Diseases* 177 (1998): 361-367.

23. Ibid.
24. Susan Burner Bankowski and Dr. Brandon Bankowski, "Let's Face the Silent Epidemic of STDs," *The World & I*, June 1999.
25. "11 Leading Causes of Death, United States, 2002," Webbased Injury Statistics Query and Reporting System (WISQARS), National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, <http://webappa.cdc.gov/cgi-bin/broker.exe> (accessed April 20, 2005). "5 Leading Causes of Death, United States, 2002," Web-based Injury Statistics Query and Reporting System (WISQARS), National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, <http://webappa.cdc.gov/cgi-bin/broker.exe> (accessed April 20, 2005). See also: Suicide & Life-Threatening Behavior 28(1) (1998): 1-23.
26. "Prevalence of the Human Immunodeficiency Virus Among University Students;" *New England Journal of Medicine* 323 (1990): 1538-1541.
27. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, "College HIV Rate Holds Steady, but Risk of Exposure Remains High," *AIDS Alert* 9 (November 1994): 153-156.
28. Ibid.
29. "Suicide: Fact Sheet," National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, <http://www.cdc.gov/ncipc/factsheets/suifacts.htm> (accessed April 20, 2005). See also: Karen W. Arenson, "Worried Colleges Step Up Efforts Over Suicide," *New York Times*, December 3, 2004, 1A.
30. "Suicide: Fact Sheet," National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, <http://www.cdc.gov/ncipc/factsheets/suifacts.htm> (accessed April 20, 2005).
31. United States Department of Health and Human Services, National Center for Health Statistics, presented in "Monthly Vital Statistics" for October 11, 1994.
32. National Youth Violence Prevention Center "Youth Suicide Fact Sheet," <http://www.safeyouth.org/scripts/facts/suicide.asp> (accessed April 20, 2005).
33. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* (December 3, 2004): 1108. Used by permission.
34. [editing-note: the officially published ebook has no reference in the text to this footnote, and whatever the print version referenced, the footnote listed "Ibid"]
35. "'New AIDS' Spreading Among Homosexual Men," *WorldNetDaily.com*, June 2, 2005, http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=44561 (accessed June 2, 2005).

36. J. D. Unwin, *Sexual Regulations and Human Behavior* (London: Williams and Norgate, 1933).

CHAPTER 4 - BEYOND LAW AND ORDER

1. "Declaration Banned From Classroom," Alliance Defense Fund Press Release, November 23, 2004, <http://www.alliancedefensefund.org/news/default.asp?mid=800&cid=3218> (April 8, 2005).
2. "U.S. History Documents Banned Because They Mention God," Christianity Examiner on the Web, http://www.christianexaminer.com/Articles/Articles%20Jan05/Art_Jan05_06.html (accessed April 8, 2005).
3. In that controversial decision, Justice Hugh Black wrote the majority opinion, which said in part: "The First Amendment has erected a wall between church and state. That wall must be kept high and impregnable. We could not approve the slightest breach:" [Everson v. Board of Education, 330 U.S. 1 (1947).]
4. "LifeSiteNews.com and Pro-family Groups Subject to Intimidation from Gay Rights Leaders," LifeSite Special Report, May 3, 2004, <http://www.lifesite.net/ldn/2004/may/040503a.html> (accessed April 20, 2005).
5. Chris Bull, "Balance of justice," The Advocate, March 4, 2003. In the same article, the reporter goes on to say: "Some have speculated that justices' private musings about Souter's sexual orientation have elevated the level of debate about gay rights and the law. `David Souter isn't gay, as far as anyone knows, but there's enough speculation about it that his fellow justices have to be a little more careful about what they say, at least in his presence,' says a veteran observer of the court who didn't want to be quoted by name. `There's enough vagueness about him as a bachelor in this regard to raise the level of debate....'"
6. *Lawrence v. Texas*, 539 U.S. 558 (2003) (Scalia, J., dissenting), <http://caselaw.findlaw.com/us-supreme-court/539/558.html#opinion1> (accessed April 20, 2005).
7. Ibid.
8. Ibid.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid.
12. Jake Tapper, "Court Deals Blow to U.S. Anti-Porn Campaign," January 24,

2005, http://www.fradical.com/DOJ_Appeals_Extreme_Associates.htm (accessed April 8, 2005).

13. "The Philadelphia Five," AFA Online, <http://www.afa.net/clp/Philly5.asp> (accessed April 8, 2005).
14. Ron Storm. "U.S. Attorneys Complicit in Arrest of Christians?" WorldNetDaily.com, January 5, 2005, http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=42221 (accessed April 20, 2005).
15. While the media publicized the "Philadelphia 5" during the actual proceedings, initially eleven people had been arrested and taken into custody by the police. When counter-charges were filed, all eleven individuals were included in the suit.
16. Jim Brown, "Christian School Bomb Scare: Caller Demands Public Support for Homosexual Marriage;" Agape Press, September 12, 2003.
17. The United States Senate: Republican Policy Committee, Sen. Jon Kyl, Chairman, "The Kennedy 'Hate Crimes' Bill: An Unwise Proposal," United States Government Printing Office, July 15, 2003.
18. Ibid.
19. U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Uniform Crime Reports, "Hate Crimes Statistics 2003," November 2004.
20. U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Uniform Crime Reports, "Crime in the United States 2003," October 27, 2004, <http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/03cius.htm>. See also: Curt Anderson, "FBI Says Murders Up for 4th Straight Year," Associated Press, October 26, 2004.
21. U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Uniform Crime Reports, "Hate Crimes Statistics 2000;" http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/cius_00/hate00.pdf. A catalog of hate crimes reporting since passage of the 1990 Hate Crimes Act is available at: <http://www.firstgov.gov>.
22. Island and Letellier, *Men Who Beat the Men Who Love Them*, 14.
23. N. E. Murphy. "Queer Justice: Equal Protection for Victims of Same Sex. Domestic Violence," *Valparaiso University Law Review* 30 (1995): 335.
24. P. Barnes, "It's Just a Quarrel;" *ABA Journal* 84 (February 1998): 25.
25. Unsigned editorial, "The Hate Politics;" *Wall Street Journal*, April 2, 2001.
26. Ronald Pestritto, "The Ideology of Hate Crimes;" Claremont Institute, posted October 30, 1998, <http://www.claremont.org/writings/981030pestritto.html> (accessed April 8, 2005).

27. Ibid.

28. James B. Jacobs and Kimberly Potter, *Hate Crimes: Criminal Law & Identity Politics* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998).

CHAPTER 5 - CHANGES IN THE WORKPLACE

1. "ACLU Behind Illinois' Forced Hiring of `Gays;" WorldNetDaily.com, January 26, 2005, http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=42563 (accessed April 20, 2005).

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.

4. Stuart Shepard, "ENDA Passes Senate Committee;" Family Research Council Forum, April 30, 2002, <http://www.family.org/cforum/fnif/news/a0020586.html>.

5. According to Simmons Market Research Bureau, a consumertracking firm, the average homosexual is better educated and has a higher income than the typical heterosexual. A 1990 Simmons study found that 53 percent of homosexuals hold professional or management jobs, compared with the national average of 34 percent in the general population; 61 percent have graduated from college, compared with only 24 percent nationally; and the average homosexual household income is \$53,000 compared with \$35,000 nationally. Homosexual households, the researchers said, are twice as likely as the typical household to have incomes over \$60,000, and they're also twice as likely as the general populace to have incomes over \$250,000.

See: Marcia Philbin, "Branching Out," Miami Daily Business Review, October 6, 2000, A13; and Ronald Alsop, "Are Gay People More Affluent Than Others?" Wall Street Journal, December 30, 1999.

6. Mark Tooley, "Mainstreaming Homosexuality;" Touchstone, September-October 1999, <http://www.touchstonemag.com/archives/article.php?id=12-05-058-r> (accessed April 20, 2005).

7. Ibid.

8. James W. Button, Barbara Rienzo, and Kenneth Wald, *Private Lives, Public Conflicts: Battles Over Gay Rights in American Communities* (Washington DC: Congressional Quarterly Books, 1997).

9. Information in the following two sections of this chapter is adapted from the following article: Bo Davis, "Business as Unusual: Firms Go Gay Friendly," World, April 26, 1997, 16-17.

10. Adapted from Bo Davis, "Business as Unusual: Firms Go Gay Friendly;" World, April 26, 1997, 16-17.
11. Ibid.
12. Peterson v. Hewlett-Packard Co., 358 F.3d 599 (9th Cir. Ct. App. 2004). See also: David Watson, "Ninth Circuit Upholds Firing for Posting Anti-Gay Messages: Court Rejects Worker's Claim of Discrimination Based on Religious Beliefs;" Metropolitan NewsEnterprise (Los Angeles), January 7, 2004, 1.
13. Ibid.
14. Lawrence Morahan, "Former Homosexual Alleges EEOC Bias in Investigation;" CNSNews.com, August 29, 2001.
15. For example: Walter Olson, "When Sensitivity Training Is the Law," Wall Street Journal, January 20, 1993. Also: Seth Lubove, "Damned If You Do, Damned If You Don't," Forbes 160, December 15, 1997, 122.
16. Susan Jones, "Don't Base Civil Rights on Behavior, Group Warns," CNSNew.com, January 12, 2005, <http://www.cnsnews.com/ViewCulture.asp?Page=%5CCulture%5Carchive%5C200501%5CCUL20050112a.html> (accessed April 8, 2005).
17. Ibid.
18. Ibid.
19. Carolyn Lochhead, "White House Affirms Gay Workers' Rights: It Says Discrimination Against Federal Employees Is Barred-but Democrats Aren't Convinced," San Francisco Chronicle, April 1, 2004.
20. Todd Henneman, "Diversity Training Addresses Sexual Orientation," Workforce Management, December 2004, <http://www.workforce.com/section/11/feature/23/90/44/239046.html> (accessed April 21, 2005).
21. Zenit.org, "Scripture and Homosexuality, Part 2: An Interview With Robert A. J. Gagnon: Modern Arguments Don't Undercut Biblical Teaching," March 28, 2002, Code ZE02032820, <http://www.zenit.org/english/> (accessed April 21, 2005).
22. Cited in James Lileks, Chris Gallagher, Tait Trussell, "Scan: Short News and Commentary," American Enterprise Online, June 2001, http://www.taemag.com/issues/articleID.15516/article_detail.asp (accessed April 21, 2005).
23. These and subsequent citations draw on comments by Paul E. Rondeau, "Selling Homosexuality to America;" Regent University Law Review 14 (Spring 2002).

24. Tori DeAngelis, "New Data on Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Mental Health," American Psychological Association Monitor on Psychology 33 (February 2002), <http://www.apa.org/monitor/Feb02/newdata.html> (accessed April 21, 2005).
25. Margaret Rosario, "Understanding the Unprotected Sexual Behaviors of Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Youths: An Empirical Test of the Cognitive-Environmental Model," Health Psychology (May 1999): 272-280.
26. Deb Price, "Supreme Court Needs to Look the Contradiction in the Eye," Windy City Times, January 8, 2003, <http://www.windycitymediagroup.com/gay/lesbian/news/ARTICLE.php?AID=1630> (accessed Feb. 12, 2005).
27. Ronald Reagan, quoted in "Remarks by President at Prayer Breakfast, New York Times, August 24, 1984, A11.

CHAPTER 6 - TAKING OVER THE SCHOOLS

1. Robert Knight. "Homosexuality in an Age of Consent," The Salt and Light Handbook (Fort Lauderdale, FL: Coral Ridge Ministries, 1999).
2. "The 1972 Gay Rights Platform;" created at the National Coalition of Gay Organizations Convention, Chicago 1972, http://www.rslevinson.com/gayleissues/features/collect/onetime/bl_platform1972.htm (accessed April 11, 2005).
3. Lesea Newman, the author of Heather Has Two Mommies, has also written My Lover Is a Woman and Gloria Goes to Gay Pride, about a little girl's day at the "Gay Pride Parade" and how this affects her understanding of life with her two mommies, one of whom works as a nurse and the other is a mechanic.
4. Liberal organizations at the forefront of the movement aggressively promoting the homosexual agenda include groups such as the National Education Association (NEA), the ACLU, People for the American Way, and the alphabet soup of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered organizations, which now also includes a so-called "questioning" group that is actually a recruiting ploy used in the schools. Many public schools now have a "lesbian, gay, and straight alliance," or an LGBTQ group, organized to enlist converts.
5. "The Gay'90s: A Response to the Gay Activist Movement," Critical Issues 1, <http://www.leaderu.com/critical/gay90.html> (accessed April 11, 2005).
6. Portions of Mrs. Hill's story are related in Le Templar, "Shine Draws Attack: Janie Hill Wants Councilman Removed," Times Record News (Wichita Falls), February 13, 1999.

7. Hans Zeiger, "The NEA and GLSEN vs. America," July 2, 2004, <http://www.renewamerica.us/columns/zeiger/040702> (accessed April 21, 2005).
8. Ibid.
9. The explanation given by the homosexual lobby for the high suicide rate among teens is a total fabrication. The high rate of suicides for those who experiment with homosexuality is due to the fact that they not mature enough to deal with the volatile emotions and the obvious immorality of a lifestyle they know instinctively to be wrong.
10. "Case Background: Flores v. Morgan Hill Unified School District," ACLU of Northern California, <http://www.aclunc.org/students/040106-floresbkg.htm> 1 (accessed April 11, 2005).
11. For example, see: Louis P. Sheldon, "Here It Comes: Transgender Confusion on Campus;" Traditional Values Coalition, May 2004, <http://www.traditionalvalues.org/modules.php?name=News&file=article&sid=944>.
12. I highly recommend the book by Joseph Nicolosi, *Reparative Therapy of Male Homosexuality: A New Clinical Approach* (Northvale, NJ: J Aronson, 1997).
13. Rex Wockner, "Taking Charge: Matt Foreman of NGLTF," Windy City Times, June 25, 2003, <http://www.windycitymediagroup.com/gay/lesbian/news/ARTICLE.php?AID=3366> (accessed April 21, 2005).
14. Julie Foster, "California Schools' New Homosexual Curriculum," WorldNetDaily.com, December 26, 2000, http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=21132 (accessed April 11, 2005).
15. James Lileks, Chris Gallagher, Tait Trussell, "Scan: Short News and Commentary," American Enterprise Online, June 2001, http://www.taemag.com/issues/articleID.15516/article_detail.asp (accessed April 21, 2005).
16. "Critics Target Discount Chain for Banning Salvation Army," CNSNews.com, <http://www.townhall.com/news/politics/200412/NAT20041217a.shtml> (accessed April 21, 2005).
17. More about this activity can be viewed at <http://www.dayofsilence.org>.
18. More about this activity can be viewed at <http://www.educationnews.org/no-name-calling-week-coalition.htm> , <http://www.nonamecallingweek.org> , and <http://www.glsen.org/cgi-bin/iowa/all/library/record/1731.html>.
19. Information about this activity may be viewed at http://www.glsenla.jeffmo.com/html/lesson_plans_48.html.
20. Karla Jay and Allen Young, ed., *Lavender Culture* (New York: New York

University Press, 1994).

21. Judith A. Reisman, Kinsey: Crimes & Consequences: The Red Queen and the Grand Scheme (Arlington, VA: Institute for Media Education, 1998).
22. Ibid.
23. Frank York, "Brave New School: Public Employees Teach Kids 'Gay' Sex," WorldNetDaily, May 9, 2000, http://www.wnd.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=17490 (accessed April 11, 2005).
24. "Governor's Commission for Gay Youth Retreats to 'Safety' and 'Suicide,'" Massachusetts News, December 2000, http://www.massnews.com/past_issues/2000/12-Dec/1200fist3.htm (accessed April 22, 2005).
25. Ibid.
26. Ibid.
27. Paul Gibson, "Gay Male and Lesbian Youth Suicide," (Washington DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1989), in Report of the Secretary's Task Force on Youth Suicide, ed. Marcia R. Feinleib, January 1989.
28. Dr. Louis W. Sullivan MD, Secretary of Health and Human Services, letter to Representative William E. Dannemeyer, October 1989, quoted in Peter LaBarbera, "The Gay Youth Suicide Myth," <http://www.leaderu.com/jhs/labarbera.html> (accessed April 25, 2005).
29. LaBarbera, "The Gay Youth Suicide Myth."
30. "Homosexuality and the Schools," The Christian Activist, <http://www.thechristianactivist.com/vol3/HomosexualityAndSchools.html> (viewed April 11, 2005).
31. George A. Clowes, "Outcome-Based Education: Remaking Society One Child at a Time," School Reform News, April 1, 1998, <http://www.heartland.org/Article.cfm?artId=12713> (accessed April 11, 2005).
32. Phil Sringer, "Outcome-Based Education," Independent American Party Online, <http://www.usiap.org/Viewpoints/Society/Education/OutcomeBasedEducation.html> (accessed April 25, 2005).
33. Kirk and Madsen, After the Ball.
34. References cited here were assembled by "The Person Project" Web site, <http://www.personproject.org/Resources/Books/education-books.html> (accessed March 1, 2005).

CHAPTER 7 - SAFEGUARDING THE FAMILY

1. Cited by Stanley Kurtz in "Beyond Gay Marriage," Weekly Standard, August 4, 2003.
2. "Transgender Marriage Is Coming;" Traditional Values Coalition Special Report, <http://traditionalvalues.org/pdf files/TransgenderMarriage.pdf> (accessed April 11, 2005). Also see, Connie Parish, "Couple Tries to Move on After Arrest," Leavenworth Times, March 21, 2004, <http://www.leavenworthtimes.com/articles/2004/03/21/news/news01.txt> (accessed April 25, 2005).
3. David Poponoe and Barbara Dafoe Whitehead, "The State of Our Unions: The Social Health of Marriage in America, 2000," Rutgers University, The National Marriage Project, <http://marriage.rutgers.edu/Publications/SOOU/SOOU.htm> (accessed April 25, 2005).
4. Ibid.
5. Jan E. Stets, "Cohabiting and Marital Aggression: The Role of Social Isolation," Journal of Marriage and the Family 53 (1991): 669-680.
6. "Psychological Reasons Not to Live Together," from All About Cohabiting Before Marriage, <http://www.leaderu.com/critical/cohabitation-psycho.html> (accessed April 25, 2005).
7. Scott Stanley, A Lasting Promise: A Christian Guide to Fighting for Your Marriage (San Francisco: Josey-Bass, 1998).
8. Charles W. Socarides, Homosexuality: A Freedom Too Far (Phoenix, AZ: Adam Margrave Books, 1995). Excerpt available at <http://www.narth.com/docs/freedom.html> (accessed April 25, 2005).
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid.
11. Andrew Jacobs, "Gays Debate Radical Steps to Curb Unsafe Sex;" New York Times, February 14, 2005, AL.
12. Jeffrey Satinover, Homosexuality and the Politics of Truth (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1996), 186.
13. M. F. Schwartz and W. H. Masters, "The Masters and Johnson Treatment Program for Dissatisfied Homosexual Men," American Journal of Psychiatry 141 (1984): 173-181.
14. Gagnon, The Bible and Homosexual Practice, 25-26.

15. Joseph Farah, "Right and Wrong," WorldNetDaily.com, July 6, 1999, http://worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=14773 (accessed April 25, 2005).
16. Donna Freydkin, "Getting to Know You: Sitcoms Field Gay Characters," CNN Interactive, May 17, 1999, <http://cnn.com/SHOWBIZ/TV/9905/17/comingout/> (accessed March 1, 2005). Also, Celida B. Miramontes, "GLAAD Tackles Media: The Depiction of Gays and Lesbians Has Improved, but Remains Cliche," New University Newspaper (UC Irvine), April 25, 2001, <http://www.newu.uci.edu/archive/2000-2001/spring/010430/n-010430-glaad.html> (accessed March 1, 2005).
17. Michelangelo Signorile, "Bridal Wave;" Out, December 1993-January 1994.
18. "Poll Shows Most Americans Oppose Same-Sex Marriage;" ReligionJournal.com, <http://www.religionjournal.com/showarticle.asp?id=2163> (accessed April 25, 2005).
19. Stayer, Same-Sex Marriage, 64.
20. Stanley Kurtz, "Beyond Gay Marriage," Weekly Standard, August 4-11, 2003, <http://www.weeklystandard.com/Content/Public/Articles/000/000/002/938xpsxy.asp> (accessed April 25, 2005).
21. Lisa Leff, "Mayor Calls for Gay Marriage Support," Associated Press, February 13, 2005.
22. Rona Marech, "3,000 Jam City Hall to Celebrate Anniversaries S.F.'s Mayor;" San Francisco Chronicle, February 13, 2005, <http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2005/02/13/SAMESEX.TMP> (accessed April 25, 2005).
23. Ibid.
24. Chris Crain, "It's All About Marriage;" Washington Blade, August 22, 2003.
25. Maggie Gallagher, "What Marriage Is For," Weekly Standard, August 11, 2003.
26. Clifford Krauss, "Now Free to Marry, Canada's Gays Say, `Do I?'" New York Times, August 31, 2003.
27. Kelly Boggs, "The Homosexual Hoopla Is Backfiring," BP News, March 19, 2004.
28. Ibid.
29. Richard N. Ostling, "The 2004 Election Reinforced America's Religious and Moral Divide;" Associated Press, November 4, 2004.

CHAPTER 8 - AWAKENING THE CHURCH

1. Roper v. Simmons 112 S.W. 3d 397 (2005).
2. Van Orden v. Perry (03-1500) and McCreary County v. ACLU of KY (03-1693) (under review).
3. George Gallup Jr. and Timothy Jones, *The Next American Spirituality: Finding God in the Twenty-first Century* (Colorado Springs, CO: Cook Communications, 2000).
4. D. A. Carson, *The Gagging of God: Christianity Confronts Pluralism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996).
5. Richard John Neuhaus, *The Naked Public Square: Religion and Democracy in America* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1984).
6. "The Fundamental Orders of Connecticut, January 14, 1639;" University of Oklahoma Law Center, <http://www.law.ou.edu/hist/orders.html>, emphasis added (accessed April 11, 2005).
7. "The Mayflower Compact, 1620," University of Oklahoma Law Center, <http://www.law.ou.edu/hist/mayflow.html> (accessed April 11, 2005).
8. Ibid.
9. Jack Kinsella, "America's Communist Lawyer's Union;" Omega Letter, December 2, 2004.
10. Ibid.
11. Author interview with Delegate Don Dwyer, Maryland State House, February 16, 2005.
12. Father John Corapi, "The Laity in the Church: A Sleeping Giant;" <http://dales.sio.topcities.com/corapi/jc15.html> (accessed April 25, 2005).
13. Ibid.

CHAPTER 9 - RESTORING TRADITIONAL VALUES

1. Daniel Dreisbach, *Thomas Jefferson and the Wall of Separation Between Church and State* (New York: NYU Press, 2002).
2. Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, trans. by George Lawrence, ed. by J. P. Mayer (N.p.: 1988), 293.
3. Newt Gingrich, "Values and Bush's Victory," San Diego Union-Tribune,

November 7, 2004, http://www.signonsandiego.com/uniontrib/20041107/news_mzle7newt.html (accessed April 26, 2005).

4. Interview with Pat Robertson, "Gingrich Outlines Steps to Win the Future of America," The 700 Club, January 14, 2005, <http://www.cbn.com/cbnnews/news/050114a.asp> (accessed April 26, 2005).
5. Ibid.
6. Author Joe Dallas, who is president of Exodus International, warns that the causes of homosexuality are too complex and too variable from person to person to render a blanket analysis. However, he says, in most of the cases he has observed over many years that homosexuality develops early in life and involves (1) a child's perception of his or her relationship to parents or significant others, (2) a child's emotional response to those perceptions and responses, (3) emotional needs arising from these perceptions and responses, and (4) the sexualization of those emotional needs. For a fuller discussion of these issues, see: Joe Dallas. *Desires in Conflict: Answering the Struggle for Sexual Identity* (Eugene, OR: Harvest House, 1991), 91-94.
7. Jeff Jacoby, "Same-Sex Marriage vs. Civil Rights," Boston Globe, March 8, 2004.
8. Ibid.
9. "Statement and Request to the Congressional Black Caucus From the National Summit of African-American Pastors, Washington D.C.," Traditional Values Coalition, September 8, 2004, http://web.archive.org/web/*/http://traditionalvalues.org/pdf_files/SummitDocument.pdf (accessed April 11, 2005).
10. "Congressional Black Caucus Member Attacks AfricanAmerican Pastors," Traditional Values Coalition, http://web.archive.org/web/*/http://traditionalvalues.org/modules.php?sid=1949 (accessed April 11, 2005).
11. See the entire article: Louis P. Sheldon, "Hey, Governor, the GOP Won!" Los Angeles Times, December 29, 2004.

CHAPTER 10 - WHAT'S TO BE DONE?

1. Enrique T. Rueda, *The Homosexual Network: Private Lives & Public Policy* (Greenwich, CT: Devin Adair Co. in cooperation with the Free Congress Research and Education Foundation, 1982). See also: Enrique T. Rueda and Michael Schwartz, *Gays, AIDS, and You*. (Greenwich, CT: The Devin Adair Company, 1987), 70-71.
2. "Sexual Orientation: Fixed or Changeable," Traditional Values Coalition, http://web.archive.org/web/*/http://traditionalvalues.org/pdf_files/SexualOrientation.pdf (accessed April 11, 2005).

3. "Just the Facts About Sexual Orientation & Youth: A Primer for Principals, Educators and School Personnel;" APA Online, http://web.archive.org/web/*/http://www.apa.org/pi/lgbc/publications/justthefacts.html (accessed April 11, 2005).
4. "Gay-to-Straight Research Published in APA Journal," NARTH (National Association for Research & Therapy of Homosexuality, <http://narth.com/docs/throckarticle.html> (accessed April 26, 2005).
5. A. Dean Byrd, Shirley E. Cox, and Jeffrey W. Robinson, "Homosexuality: The Innate-Immutability Argument Finds No Basis in Science," Salt Lake Tribune, May 27, 2001.
6. Ibid.
7. Camille Paglia, *Vamps and Tramps* (New York: Vintage Books, 1994).
8. Office of the United States Attorney, Southern District of California, San Diego, California, News Release, March 1, 2005, <http://www.usdoj.gov/usa/o/cas/pr/cas5030l.2.pdf> (accessed April 11, 2005).
9. Linda Ames Nicolosi, "Should These Conditions Be Normalized?" NARTH, October 6, 2004, <http://www.narth.com/docs/symposium.html> (accessed April 11, 2005).
10. Mary Eberstadt, "'Pedophilia Chic' Reconsidered," The Weekly Standard, January 8, 2001.
11. I Do Exist: Is a Changed Life Possible?, <http://www.drthrockmorton.com/idoexist.asp> (accessed April 11, 2005).
12. Diane Mattingly, "My Path to Lesbianism," Christianity Today, February 2005, 62.
13. Ibid.
14. Michael Lumberger, "Walking in the Light;" Exodus International, http://www.exodus-international.org/testimonials_left_homosexuality_45.shtml (accessed April 26, 2005).
15. "Respectfully Quoted: A Dictionary of Quotations," number 1593, Benjamin Franklin, <http://www.bartleby.com/73/1593.html> (accessed April 26, 2005).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bennett, William J. *The Broken Hearth: Reversing the Moral Collapse of the American Family*. New York: Doubleday, 2001.
- Brinkmann, Susan. *The Kinsey Corruption: An Expose on the Most Influential "Scientist" of Our Time (based on the work of Judith Reisman, et al.)*. West Chester, PA: Ascension Press, 2004.
- Carson, D. A. *The Gagging of God: Christianity Confronts Pluralism*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
- Comiskey, Andrew. *Pursuing Sexual Wholeness: How Jesus Heals the Homosexual*. Lake Mary, FL: Charisma House, 1988.
- Dallas, Joe. *When Homosexuality Hits Home*. Eugene, OR: Harvest House, 2004.
- . *Desires in Conflict*. Eugene, OR: Harvest House, 2003.
- . *How Should We Respond? An Exhortation to the Church on Loving the Homosexual*. Colorado Springs: Focus on the Family, 1999.
- Davies, Bob and Lela Gilbert. *Portraits of Freedom: 14 People Who Came Out of Homosexuality*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2001.
- Davies, Bob and Lori Rentzel. *Coming Out of Homosexuality: New Freedom for Men and Women*. Downers Grover, IL: InterVarsity, 1993.
- Dreisbach, Daniel, Thomas Jefferson and the Wall of Separation Between Church and State. New York: NYU Press, 2002.
- Floyd, Ronnie W. *The Gay Agenda: It's Dividing the Family, the Church, and a Nation*. Los Angeles, CA: New Leaf Press, 2004.
- Gagnon, Robert A. J. *The Bible and Homosexuality: Texts and Hermeneutics*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2000.
- Gallup Jr., George and Timothy Jones. *The Next American Spirituality: Finding God in the Twenty-first Century*. Colorado Springs: Cook Communications, 2000.
- Haley, Mike. *101 Frequently Asked Questions About Homosexuality*. Colorado Springs, CO: Focus on the Family, 2004.

- Hamburger, Philip. Separation of Church and State. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Press, 2002.
- Howard, Jeanette. Out of Egypt: Leaving Lesbianism Behind. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1994.
- Hunter, James Davison. Culture Wars: The Struggle to Define America. New York: Basic Books, 1991.
- Island, David and Patrick Letellier. Men Who Beat the Men Who Love Them. New York: Haworth Press, 1991.
- Miller, Zell. A National Party No More: The Conscience of a Conservative Democrat. Macon, GA: Stroud & Hall, 2003.
- Nicolosi, Joseph. Healing Homosexuality: Case Stories of Reparative Therapy. Northvale, NJ: J Aronson, 1993.
- . Reparative Therapy of Male Homosexuality: A New Clinical Approach. Northvale, NJ: J Aronson, 1997.
- Reisman, Judith A. Kinsey, Sex, and Fraud: The Indoctrination of a People- An Investigation Into the Human Sexuality Research of Alfred C. Kinsey, Wardell B. Pomeroy, Clyde E. Martin, and Paul H. Gebhard. Lafayette, LA: Huntington House Publishers, 1990.
- . Crimes & Consequences: The Red Queen and the Grand Scheme. Arlington, VA: Institute for Media Education, 1998.
- Rueda, Enrique T. The Homosexual Network: Private Lives & Public Policy. Greenwich, CT: Devin Adair Co. in cooperation with the Free Congress Research and Education Foundation, 1982.
- Satinover MD, Jeffrey. Homosexuality and the Politics of Truth. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1996.
- Schmidt, Thomas E. Straight and Narrow? Compassion and Clarity in the Homosexuality Debate. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1995.
- Socraides, Charles. Homosexuality: A Freedom Too Far. Phoenix, AZ: Adam Margrave 1995.
- Stayer, Matthew D. Same-Sex Marriage: Putting Every Household at Risk. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2004.
- Unwin, J. D. Sex and Culture. London: Oxford University Press, H. Milford, 1934.

INDEX

A

- Abel, Gene 145
abortion 229, 232
abstinence 31
Abzug, Rep. Bella 112
American Civil Liberties Union
 (ACLU) 21, 107, 134, 137,
 142, 144, 178, 180, 187, 188,
 202, 230
ACT UP 50, 51, 96
Adams, John 78, 79
Adorno, Theodor 20
adultery 30, 36
affirmative action 26
affirming churches 214
African Americans 4, 28, 205–209,
 214
American Federation of Teachers
 (AFT) 132
After the Ball 24
age of consent 26, 229
Alliance Defense Fund 79, 108
alternative lifestyle 2, 48, 52
American Bar Association (ABA)
 93
American Family Association 86,
 114
American Psychiatric Association
 (APA) 4, 21–23, 60, 229
American Psychological
 Association 60, 139, 225
Amin, Idi 36
Anti-Defamation League (ADL) 43
Antichrist, agenda of 186
antidiscrimination 49, 107, 114,
 120, 141, 171, 214
anti-antidiscrimination 83
Ashcroft, Attorney General John
 215

Americans United for the
Separation of Church and
State (AUSCS) 134
authority, parental 145

B

Bailey, Michael 61
Baldwin, Roger 188
Ball, Alan 45
Bankowski, Brandon 65
Bankowski, Susan 65
Barbary Coast 17
Barna Research Group 180
Battalion, Joseph 165
“Beat” Generation 19
Bennett, William 31
Bible 8, 12, 79, 117, 118, 122, 155,
161, 163, 169, 185, 186, 190,
194, 201, 236–239
and judgment of homosexuality
35
biblical standards 125
Bicks, Jenny 44
Big Brother 130
“Big Lie” 48, 49, 51, 52, 130
bigotry 128
bigotry, anti-Christian 105, 134,
139, 159, 163, 182, 214, 215
Birch, Elizabeth 45, 46
Black, Justice Hugo L. 199, 200
Blackmun, Justice Harry 37
Blagojevich, Gov. Rod 107, 108,
119
Blaine Amendments 199
Blair, Ezell 206
Bloch, Scott 120
body politick 185
Boggs, Kelly 172, 173
Boone, Pat 210
“born gay” myth 6, 28, 52, 53,
60–62, 139, 225, 226

Boston Globe 41
Bowers v. Hardwick 81
Boy Scouts of America 26, 38, 131,
136, 142, 188, 224
brainwashing 43
Breslin, Jimmy 16, 17
Briggs, Senator John 211
Bright Line Bill 183
Brokaw, Tom 42
Bryant, Anita 75, 210
Bush, President George H. W. 72
Bush, President George W. 14, 60,
120, 173, 174

C

“camel in the tent” 149
Cameron, Paul 57
Carson, D. A. 179, 180
Carter, President Jimmy 188
Centers for Disease Control and
Prevention (CDC) 6, 58, 66,
124, 237
Ceausescu, Nicolae 36
Chinese Cultural Revolution 24
Christian values 1, 3, 27, 79, 116,
118
Christianity 32, 40, 74, 81
assault on 3, 15
church and state 74, 183–186, 199,
200, 210
civil rights 1, 4, 111, 116, 172, 201,
206–208, 230
Civil Rights Act of 1964 112
civil unions 120, 167–170
civilization 32, 55, 56, 72, 122, 123,
155, 158
history of 11, 29, 30, 31
Claremont Institute 94
Clinton, President Bill 71, 165
Clinton, Senator Hillary 212
Close, Glenn 44
Cohen, Bruce 45
Cohen, Jaffe 47

Communist Party USA 19, 49, 136,
188
compassion 15
Concord Academy 136
Congressional Black Caucus
(CBC) 207, 208
Constitution 177, 198, 200, 204,
219, 240
 amending 170, 171
conversion 24, 25
Corapi, Father John 193, 194
Corso, Gregory 19
Couric, Katie 42
covenant 239
covenant society 203, 204
Crain, Chris 171, 172
Crenshaw Christian Center 208
Cruse, James 85
cultural energy 29
cultural revolution 106
culture war 13, 14, 105, 240
culture 140, 194
 American 225
 dismantling of 49
 homosexual 106, 109
 homosexual-friendly 93, 121
 lavender 144
 of death 194
 secular 73
 sexualized 215
Cummins, Mary 148

D

Daddy's Roommate 131–134
Dailey, Timothy J. 54
Dannemeyer, Bill 97
Daschle, Senator Tom 203
Daughters of Bilitis 22
Davis, Gov. Gray 141, 212
Dean, Howard 212
death penalty 177
death threats 70
deception 129, 163, 181

Declaration of Independence 79,
 203
 Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA)
 164
 Department of Justice (DOJ) 86,
 87, 215
 depression 124
 desensitization 24, 25, 123
 destructive forces 13
 Diener, Mark 85
 Diggs, John R. 4
 Diller, Barry 45
 discrimination 126
 diseases 14, 36, 53–57, 62–66, 70,
 72, 124, 125, 160, 161
 disinformation 14, 27, 44, 48–53,
 58, 67, 69, 124, 129, 131, 148,
 168, 225, 231
 Disney Company 45–47, 114
 Disney Studios 46
 diversity 2, 71, 81, 115, 116, 119,
 125, 129, 158, 179
 diversity training 114, 141
 Dixon, Mary 107
 Dobson, Dr. James 103
 domestic partners 112, 117, 133,
 141, 230
 domestic violence 92, 93, 157
 “Don’t ask, don’t tell” 142
 DreamWorks Studios 45
 Dreisbach, Daniel 200
 Diagnostic and Statistical Manual
 (DSM) 21–23
 Dugas, Gaetan 58
 Dwyer, Delegate Don 189–192

E

Eberstadt, Mary 230
 Echoes of Faith Church 97
 Equal Employment Opportunity
 Commission (EEOC) 71, 72
 Eichel, Edward W. 39, 40
 Eisner, Michael 45, 46, 72
 Elders, Joycelyn 229

Ellerbee, Linda 42, 44
Employment Non-Discrimination
Act (ENDA) 109–111, 116
equal rights 1, 111
Escobar, Ramon 42
Ettelbrick, Paula 154, 155, 164
evangelical juggernaut 200, 201,
209
Everson v. Board of Education 80,
199, 200
ex-gays 70, 231–233
Exodus International 205, 226,
232, 233
Extreme Associates 84

F

Fahling, Brian 86
Fairfax High School (Los Angeles)
134, 135, 136
fairness 113, 114
faith, family, and freedom 13
faith, loss of 31
family formation 157
family values 75, 174
traditional 166
Family Research Council 87, 108,
109
Farah, Joseph 162
Father Knows Best 43
feminism 14
Ferguson, Gil 97
firebombing 87
First Amendment 92, 99, 111, 199,
216
Focus on the Family 103, 107
Ford Foundation 38
Ford, Rep. Harold 208
Foreman, Matt 120, 140
Forster, Peter 15
Founding Fathers 9, 111, 165, 187,
190, 200–202, 216, 239
Fourth Amendment 92
Frank, Rep. Barney 98, 110, 214
Franklin, Benjamin 240

freedom of religion 181, 216
freedom of speech 87, 181, 182,
216
Freedom to Marry 172
French Quarter 17
Fuentes, Joe 114
“full faith and credit” 81
Fundamental Orders of
Connecticut 183, 184, 187

G

Gagnon, Robert A. J. 35, 36, 122,
161
GALAXE 113
Gallup Poll of Religion 178, 179
Gallup, George 179
Gardiner, Marshall 156
Gast, Sandy 156
Gay & Lesbian Alliance Against
Defamation (GLAAD) 41,
44, 81, 163, 218
Gay Activist's Alliance 22
Gay and Lesbian Day 46
Gay and Lesbian Human Rights
Commission 155
gay and lesbian studies 21
Gay Day Parade 50
gay gene 139, 226
Gay, Lesbian and Straight
Educational Network
(GLSEN) 7, 44, 132, 136–
138, 142–146
Gay, Lesbian and Straight Teachers
Network (GLSTN) 138
gay rights 2, 3, 24, 26, 27, 47, 59,
60, 129, 139, 158
Gay Rights, Special Rights 189, 191,
217
Gay Straight Alliance (GSA) 136
Geffen, David 45
gender confusion 119, 157, 161
gender identity 120, 138, 143
conflict 69
disorder (GID) 156

Gibson, Mel 215
Gibson, Paul 147
Gingrich, House Speaker Newt
202, 203, 204
Ginsburg, Allen 19
Ginsburg, Justice Ruth Bader 229,
230
God's creative order 155–157, 169,
180, 238, 239
Goldman, E. L. 5
Gore, Vice President Al 60
Governor's Commission on Gay
and Lesbian Youth 147
Gramsci, Antonio 20
Great Commission 193
Green, Dennis 85
Greenwich Village 17, 59, 237
Greer, Ron 93
Griffin, Sean 47
Gutierrez, Noe 231

H

Haley, J. Evetts 183
Hamer, Dean 27, 61, 62, 226
Hamilton Square Baptist Church
101–103
Hannon, Gerald 144, 145
hate crimes 7, 8, 16, 80, 87–91, 94,
95, 107, 109, 133, 141, 142,
171
hate speech 16, 48, 95, 125, 139
Hay, Harry 19, 20
Health and Human Services,
Department of 148
Heather Has Two Mommies 131–
134
hedonism 27, 35, 58, 72
Heflin, Senator Howell 71
heritage, Christian 185
Hideki, Tojo 36
Hill, Janie 133, 134
Hillsdale College 136
Hispanics 28, 208

Hitler, Adolf 36, 44, 51, 76, 84, 101,
 130, 138, 181
 HIV/AIDS 4–6, 56–58, 62–69, 123,
 125, 145, 146, 159, 160, 170,
 188, 207, 234, 235
 infection rates 4
 Hollywood 40–47, 124, 160–163,
 202, 203, 210–212
 homo-fascist tactics 88, 100–105
 homosexual clubs 136
 Homosexual Day of Silence 137,
 142
 homosexual gene 60, 61 (*See also*:
 gay gene)
 homosexual marriage 26, 41, 58,
 81, 82, 113, 120, 130, 140,
 154, 156, 163–168, 172, 173,
 206, 207, 228, 231
 homosexual movement 2, 3, 17–
 25, 56, 59, 82, 106, 109, 110,
 115, 122, 123, 128, 141, 156,
 188, 201, 209, 210, 216, 221,
 226, 230, 240
Homosexuality: A Freedom Too Far
 158
 Hooker, Thomas 183
 House UnAmerican Activities
 Committee 19, 49
 Howe, James 143
 Hull, Gov. Jane 188
 human papillomavirus (HPV) 64,
 65
 human rights 15, 107
 Human Rights Campaign (HRC)
 45, 81, 112, 114, 116, 146,
 218, 224
 Hunter, James Davison 13
 Hussein, Saddam 36
 Hyperion Press 46, 47

I

Illinois Family Institute 107, 119
 “incrementalism” 230

indoctrination 111, 130, 134, 146,
163, 215, 218
infections 5, 65
Innes, David 102, 103
Institute on Religion and
Democracy 110
Internet 32, 122, 132, 162, 217,
218, 227
intervention 235
intimidation 117, 121, 129, 130,
133, 140, 144
Island, David 92
It's Elementary 131, 138, 231

J

Jackson, President Andrew 199
Jacobs, James B. 94
Jacoby, Jeff 205, 206
jamming 24, 25
Jefferson, President Thomas 195,
199, 203, 204
Jefferson, Rep. William 208
Jennings, Kevin 132, 136, 146, 147
Jennings, Peter 42
Jinks, Dan 45
Johnson, Senator Lyndon 182, 183
Jones, Timothy 179
Joos, Gustaaf 16
judgment 12, 73, 109
 biblical 117
 eternal 191, 221
 of homosexual sin 8, 12, 18, 35,
 117, 221–223, 235, 236, 239
 moral 84, 134, 201, 218, 221,
 235
judicial activism 14, 26, 203–207

K

Kaiser, Charles 160
Kameny, Frank 20
Kardiner, Abraham 22
Kennedy, President John 111, 112
Kennedy, Senator Ted 89, 90, 94,
109, 212–214

Kerouac, Jack 19
Kerry, Senator John 9, 60, 173
King, Coretta Scott 208
King, Martin Luther, Jr. 206, 208
King, Rodney 94
Kinsey Institute 38, 39
Kinsey, Alfred 6, 37–40, 52, 57, 145
Kirk, Marshall 24, 27, 34, 48–50,
123, 149
Kleinplatz, Peggy 229
Knight, Robert 87, 88, 128
“Know Nothings” 199
Kofman, Jeffrey 42
Kohl, Frank 156
Kramer, Larry 160
Krupski, Jim 88
Kurtz, Stanley 166, 167
Kyl, Senator John 90

L

LaBarbera, Peter 108, 119
Lafferty, Andrea 103
Lafferty, James 222, 223
LaHaye, Beverly 71
Lancaster, Gary 84
lavender mafia 42, 44
Lawrence v. Texas 25, 81, 82, 84
Leave It to Beaver 43
Legman, Gershon 116
Letellier, Patrick 92
LeTourneau, Jeff 96
LeVay, Simon 27, 61, 62, 226
Levine, Judith 229
Lewis, Rep. John 207
life expectancy 56–58, 67
Lincoln, President Abraham 33
Lisaius, Ken 120
“live and let live” 15, 47, 189, 211
Living Waters 233
Lloyd, Lauren 46
Lopez, Ben 168
Ludlow, Roger 183
Luksik, Peg 148
Lumberger, Michael 232–234

M

Mackey, Connie 109
Madison, Paula 42
Madison, President James 203
Madsen, Hunter 24, 27, 123, 149
mainline churches, demise of 209, 213
Marcavage, Michael 85
March on Washington (of 1993) 3, 26, 71, 98
Marco, Anton V. 49, 50, 51, 132
Marcuse, Herbert 20
marriage 9, 31
 civil 169
 defense of 75, 166
 destruction of 164
 homosexual 26 (*See also*:
 homosexual marriage)
 sanctity of 165, 231
 traditional 29, 207
Marshner, Connie 12
Martin, Clyde 37
Martin, Walter 209, 210
Maslow, Abraham 39
Masters and Johnson 161
Mattachine Society 19–22
Mattingly, Diane 232
Mayflower Compact 184–187
McCain, Franklin 206
McCaleb, Gary 79
McCarthy, Joseph 19
McIlhenny, Charles 87, 102
McLaughlin, John 98
McNeil, Joseph 206
McWilliams, Danny 47
media complicity 3, 25–27, 34, 43–47, 63, 81, 124, 160, 211, 212, 240
Meehan, William Austin 86
Mein Kampf 51, 84
Meron, Neil 44
Miller, Senator Zell 174
molestation 135, 136, 145

Moore, Michael 203
moral authority 122
moral judgment 84, 218, 235, 240
moral values 9, 10, 14, 28, 31, 40,
73–75, 81, 84, 105, 109, 113,
116, 126, 131–134, 169, 177,
187, 193, 201, 205, 216, 229
morality
 biblical 205
 public 177
Moses, Charles 229
multiculturalism 14
Murray, William J. 201
Myers, Chief Bill 162
myth, 10 percent 38–40 (*See also*:
10 percent myth)

N

Naked Public Square 182
North American Man/Boy Love
 Association (NAMBLA) 227,
 228
National Association for
 Research and Therapy of
 Homosexuality (NARTH)
 97, 139, 205, 225, 226
National Academy of Sciences 60,
 139
National Center for Lesbian Rights
 143
National Gay and Lesbian Task
 Force 120, 123, 140, 158, 167
National Institute for Healthcare
 Research 157
National Lesbian and Gay
 Journalism Association 42
National Lesbian and Gay Task
 Force 81
Nazi tactics 51, 70, 76, 86, 88,
 96–105, 130, 138, 140
National Education Association
 (NEA) 6, 7, 131, 132, 136,
 144, 174, 180, 225, 236
Neeson, Liam 40

Neuhaus, Richard John 182
New Testament 35, 214
New York Times 41, 42
Newdow, Michael 14
Newsday 16, 17
Newsom, Mayor Gavin 167, 168,
173, 230
Nicolosi, Joseph 97, 139, 225
National Institute of Mental Health
(NIMH) 22, 124, 157
No Name-Calling Week 143
North Valley Baptist Church 96
Northwest Ordinance 187

O

Oakland Christian Center 104
Office of Special Counsel (White
House) 120
Okwedy, Kristopher 93
Old Testament 35, 74, 214
One Teenager in Ten 135
Orwell, George 130
Outfest 85, 86
Ovadal, Ralph 87
*Overhauling of Straight America,
The* 27, 34, 47, 48, 149
Ozzie and Harriet 43

P

Paglia, Camille 226
Paige, Hon. Rod 136
pandemic 58, 123
parental rights 75
Parents and Friends of Lesbians
and Gays 44
Parents Rights Commission 145
Passion of the Christ, The 215
Patton, Mary Beth 232
Pavone, Father Frank 176, 195
People for the American Way
(PAW) 202
Pawlick, J. Edward 41
Pawlick, Sally 41

pedophilia 144, 145, 227, 228, 229,
239
Penn, William 79
persecution 15, 16, 48, 70, 71, 80,
85–93, 96–105, 133, 138, 139,
159, 214, 215
perversion 227, 239
Pestritto, Ronald J. 94
Peterson, Richard 116, 117
Phelps, Fred 222, 223
Philadelphia Five 85, 86
Pill, Erastes 34, 48–50, 149 (*See*
also: Madsen, Hunter)
Pillar, Richard 61
Pink Angels 85
pink proms 137
Planned Parenthood, 37
Pledge of Allegiance 14, 118, 188,
203, 204
Pol Pot 36
political correctness 194
Pollard, Eric 50
polyamory 164, 166
polygamy 228
popular culture 3, 32, 40, 123 (*See*
also: culture)
pornography 37–39, 75, 84, 85,
132, 135, 170, 181
Potter, Kimberly 94
Powell, Colin 28
Power Community Church 97
Price, Deb 125, 126
Price, Frederick K. C. 208
Princeton Theological Seminary
213
procreation 155, 161, 172, 226
Project 10 134
promiscuity 63, 132, 169
propaganda 24, 25, 44, 48–53, 58,
69, 130–135, 145–148, 158,
163, 225

R

rainbow curriculum 148

Rather, Dan 42
 Reagan, Gov. Ronald 211
 Reagan, President Ronald 126
 rebellion 18, 20, 36, 194
 reconciliation, denominational
 209, 213
 recruitment of children 43, 44,
 130, 138, 144–150, 158, 159,
 215, 218, 224, 227–229
 redemption 52
 Reed, Ralph 71
 Reicken, Henry 23
 Reinhardt, Stephen 118
 Reisman, Judith 39, 40, 145
 relativism 31, 155, 179
 religious freedom 119, 132
 religious liberty 75, 92, 103, 105,
 117, 126, 133, 216
 renewal, Christian 209
 reparative therapy 97
 Repent America 85
 restoration 232, 233, 235, 236
 revival 72–73
 Richmond, David 206
 Riefenstahl, Leni 44, 138
 right to life 75
 righteousness, calling to 192–194
 rights
 God-given 190
 homosexual 16
 Religious Liberties Protection Act
 (RLPA) 126
 Robertson, Pat 75, 203, 210
 Robinson, Eugene V. 213
Roe v. Wade 188
 Ronen, Carol 108
Roper v. Simmons 181
 Roth, Joe 45
 Rueda, Enrique T. 225

S
 safe schools 143, 144, 147, 215
 Salvation Army, The 142

same-sex marriage 1, 9 (*See also*:
 homosexual marriage)
sanctity of life 75
Sanger, Margaret 37
Satan 217
Satinover, Jeffrey 4, 97, 161
Scalia, Justice Antonin 82–84
Schlesinger, Arthur 8
schools 2, 9, 21, 26, 39, 82, 125,
 129–134, 136, 141–144, 147,
 149, 150, 159, 162, 174, 187,
 211, 215, 236, 240
Schumacher, Tom 46
Schwarzenegger, Gov. Arnold 126,
 212
Sekulow, Jay Alan 106
self-restraint 3, 28
sensitivity training 114
sexual identity 110, 139, 140, 156,
 158, 225, 233
sexual perversion 37–39, 227, 239
sexual predators 227–229
sexually transmitted diseases 5, 6,
 57, 62–65, 125
Shaffer, David 148
Shays, Rep. Chris 110
Sheldon, Beverly 98, 99
Sheldon, Louis P. 198
Sheldon, Stephen 96
Shepard, Matthew 222
Shine, Dan 134
Signorile, Michelangelo 163, 164
Smith, Bob 47
Socarides, Charles 23, 24, 157, 158
social conditioning 19
Society for Human Resource
 Management 110, 113
sodomy 1, 81, 118
sodomy laws 25
Somers, Georgi 156
Sorokin, Pitrim 30
Souter, Justice David 82
Southern Baptist Convention 114

Speilberg, Stephen 45
 spiritual awakening 74
 Stahl, Leslie 42
 Stalin, Josef 36
 standards
 biblical 13, 33, 70, 73, 75, 125,
 139, 140, 159, 169, 170, 185–
 187, 191, 205
 ethical 28
 moral 105, 134, 228
 Staver, Matthew 165
 Stephanopoulos, George 42
 Stern, Howard 72
 Stills, Stephen 55
Stone v. Graham 178
 Stonewall Riots 59
 storm troopers 97, 101
 Streisand, Barbra 44
 substance abuse 5, 50, 51, 67, 124,
 125, 234
 suicide 65, 66, 124, 137, 147
 Sullivan, Hon. Louis 148
 Sulzberger, Arthur (Pinch), Jr. 40,
 41
 Supreme Court 9, 37, 41, 60, 80–
 83, 177–181, 188, 190, 201,
 204, 229
 of British Columbia 15
 of California 167
 of Kansas 156
 of Massachusetts 81, 164
 Swift, Michael 2

T

10 percent myth 38, 39, 40 (*See*
 also: myth, 10 percent)
 television networks 44
 Ten Commandments 178, 184
 textbooks, pro-homosexual 149,
 150
 Thomas, Justice Clarence 82
 thought police 94
 thought reform 24
 Throckmorton, Warren 231

Thune, Senator John 203
Tocqueville, Alexis de 200
tolerance 2, 81, 115–119, 126, 128,
158, 172
Tolerance Pledge 43
Tooley, Mark 110, 111
Toynbee, Arnold 29
traditional values 3, 32, 37, 199,
201, 205, 212, 219
Traditional Values Coalition
(TVC) 9, 48, 60, 75, 86, 98,
121, 137, 168, 170, 183, 189,
193, 207, 215–218, 230, 235
Troupis, Chris 118
Troy, Daniel 8
Turner, Tina 55, 72

U

U.S. Census Bureau 157
Unwin, J. D. 29, 72, 238
Uribe, Virginia 135, 136

V

values
biblical 191
Christian 178–181, 184, 185,
191, 198, 216, 240
moral 182, 183, 190, 229
traditional 141, 205, 212, 219
values voters 8, 10, 74, 173, 174,
186, 202, 212
Varela, Antonio 16
Vidmar, Patricia 79
vigilance 195
Viguerie, Richard 202

W

wall of separation 200
warnings from history 28–30, 72,
111, 139, 155, 158, 159, 170,
219, 238
Washington Blade 50, 171
Washington, President George 14,
74, 79, 126

We Are Family Foundation 43
Webster, Noah 201
Westboro Baptist Church 222
White House 120, 121, 178, 202,
212
Whiteman, Scott 145
Wilberforce, William 238
Wilde, Oscar 172
will of the people 84
Williams, Stephen 79
Williamson, Kevin 44
Wilson, Carl 29, 30
Wilson, Governor Pete 97
Winfrey, Oprah 179
Wolfson, Evan 172
Wonderful World of Disney 45
workplace 106
 discrimination 113, 126, 132
 religion-free 71, 72
World Court 215
WORLD magazine 112–116
World War II 18, 36
WorldNetDaily.com 86, 162
worldview 130

Z

Zadan, Craig 44
Zedong, Mao 36
Zeiger, Hans 136